Fighting Climate Change: International Attitudes Toward Climate Policies*

Antoine Dechezleprêtre, Adrien Fabre, Tobias Kruse,
Bluebery Planterose, Ana Sanchez Chico, and Stefanie Stantcheva

May 13, 2023

Abstract

This paper studies how people across the world perceive and understand climate change and climate policies, which factors determine their support for climate action, and what type of information shifts their policy views. We design and run new large-scale surveys on more than 40,000 respondents in 20 countries, covering the major greenhouse gas emitters in developed and developing economies. We thus provide new, comprehensive, international microdata on people's perceptions, understanding, and policy views related to climate change, combined with detailed background information on their socioeconomic characteristics, energy use, and lifestyles. We show that, across countries, support for climate policies hinges on three key perceptions centered around the effectiveness of the policies in reducing emissions (effectiveness concerns), their distributional impacts on lower-income households (inequality concerns), and their impact on the respondents' household (self-interest). In the experimental part, we show randomly selected subsamples pedagogical videos on either the impacts of climate change in their country or how major climate policies work – their effectiveness in reducing emissions and their distributional implications. Explaining how policies work and who can benefit from them is critical to fostering policy support, whereas simply informing people about climate change's impacts is ineffective.

JEL codes: Q54, Q58, D78, H23, P48
Keywords: Climate change, climate policies, carbon tax, perceptions, survey, experiment

*Corresponding author: Stantcheva: Harvard, CEPR, and NBER (sstantcheva@fas.harvard.edu). Dechezleprêtre: LSE and OECD (antoine.dechezlepretre@oecd.org); Fabre: CNRS and CIRED (fabre.adri1@gmail.com); Kruse: LSE and OECD (tobias.kruse@oecd.org); Planterose: PSE (bluebery.planterose@psemail.eu). We are grateful for financial support from the OECD, the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the French CAE, and the Spanish Ministry for the Ecological Transition. We also acknowledge support from the Grantham Foundation for the Protection of the Environment and the Economic and Social Research Council through the Centre for Climate Change Economics and Policy. We thank Laurence Boone, Stefano Carattini, Eyal Frank, Michael Greenstone, Cameron Hepburn, Joe Shapiro, Matthias Sutter, OECD researchers, and numerous seminar participants for valuable comments. The project is approved by IRB at Harvard University (IRB21-0137), and was preregistered in the AER RCT Registry (AEARCTR-0007300).

1 Introduction

Limiting the average temperature increase to less than 2°C above pre-industrial levels requires drastically reducing global emissions by 2050 (IPCC 2021). Judging by publicly announced long-term commitments and goals, policymakers appear to be taking this imperative seriously. Over 140 countries representing 90% of global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions have so far adopted or announced climate neutrality targets (NPUC 2021) implying net-zero GHG emissions by mid-century. However, while climate mitigation ambitions are robust, bold policy measures to achieve them are strikingly lagging. Global energy-related and industrial process CO_2 emissions (36.6 Gt in 2021) are only projected to slowly fall to 32 Gt by 2050 (IEA 2022), leading to a 2.7°C temperature rise by 2100, greatly increasing the likelihood of catastrophic impacts for societies and economies (Climate Action Tracker 2021; IPCC 2022).

Indeed, climate policies–particularly carbon pricing mechanisms, which economists see as key instruments to reduce emissions (Stiglitz et al. 2017)–have often been challenging to implement, even when the objective of limiting global warming is broadly accepted. As our new large-scale international survey across 20 countries reveals, at least three-quarters of respondents in each country agree that "climate change is an important problem" and that their country "should take measures to fight" it (see Figure 1), but this often does not translate into an agreement on which climate policies to support.

In this paper, we seek to understand what drives support for or opposition to important climate policies across the world. Our first contribution is to collect new large-scale survey data from 20 countries on people's perceptions of, understanding of, and attitudes toward climate change and climate policies. We currently lack comprehensive data on how people worldwide perceive and reason about these issues. However, climate change is a global problem with disparate impacts across countries and people (Carleton et al. 2022). It is thus necessary to study these questions internationally across major GHG emitters in both developed and developing economies.

The second contribution leverages our in-depth surveys to study which factors matter most for policy support. Does resistance to new climate policies stem from a lack of knowledge about the impacts of climate change? Are citizens worried about the effects of policies on their own budget and lifestyle? Do they hold broader concerns about the effects of climate policies on particular groups and the economy? Or do they question whether these policies will mitigate climate change? Our third contribution is to show what type of information is most important to shift views on climate policies.

To study these questions, we conduct large-scale international surveys on over 40,000 respondents in the twenty countries depicted in Figure 2. These countries span different income levels and social and economic contexts. They account for 72% of global 2017 CO_2 emissions (JRC 2018) and include 18 out of the 21 largest emitters of greenhouse gases.[1] We elicit respondents' knowledge and understanding of climate change and their views on a broad range of climate mitigation policies. Importantly, we do not just ask whether re-

[1]The three large emitters not included in our sample are Russia, Iran, and Saudi Arabia.

Figure 1: Share of respondents who agree (somewhat to strongly) that "Climate change is an important problem" or that their country "should take measures to fight climate change"



Figure 2: The 20 countries covered in the survey



spondents support or oppose a given policy. Instead, we include specific questions about their understanding and perceptions of how these policies work regarding their effectiveness,

economic impacts, distributional consequences, and effects on their household. In addition, we show random sub-samples of respondents pedagogical videos on the impacts of climate change in their country (the *Climate impacts* treatment) or on how three key climate policies – a ban on combustion-engine cars, a carbon tax with cash transfers, and a green infrastructure program – work (the *Climate policies* treatment), allowing us to measure the causal effect of specific information provision on policy views.

Our paper leverages advances in survey methodology, which is key for studying important but otherwise invisible things such as perceptions, attitudes, reasonings, and views (see, among others Stantcheva (2021) for reasoning about policies, Haaland, Roth and Wohlfart (2020) for information experiments, Johnston et al. (2017) for guidance on stated preferences studies, and Stantcheva (2022) for a review of survey methodology). Economists are somewhat weary of surveys. We often prefer revealed preference approaches, but these are not well-suited to uncovering the reasoning underlying people's policy preferences. While surveys permit measuring and analyzing people's thinking more directly, some worry that self-reported survey answers may not be accurate. However, a growing body of research shows that when possible to measure both, survey responses are correlated with real-world or real-stakes behaviors (see Fehr, Epper and Senn (2020), Tannenbaum et al. (2020), Funk (2016), and Hainmueller, Hangartner and Yamamoto (2015)). We show below (Figure 3) that self-reported preferences are positively correlated with "real stakes" behaviors, where we ask respondents to invest time or money to express their views. Furthermore, to ensure that the data is of high quality and the survey results are credible and robust, we employ many techniques described briefly in Section 2 and in-depth in Stantcheva (2022).

Our main findings are as follows. First, we shed light on the factors that foster people's support for more climate action. Three fundamental beliefs are major predictors of whether people support a given climate policy: (i) its perceived ability to reduce emissions (effectiveness), (ii) its perceived distributional impacts on lower-income households (inequality concerns), and (iii) its perceived economic impact on people's own household (self-interest). By contrast, concerns about climate change are not significant predictors of respondents' policy views – most respondents are already deeply concerned about climate impacts. Similarly, even though respondents exhibit varying degrees of knowledge about climate change's causes and consequences, this knowledge does not significantly correlate with their policy views.

Consequently, support for climate policies strongly depends on their specific modalities. There is more support for policy designs perceived to be more effective and progressive. These include targeted investment programs (e.g., in clean energy infrastructure and other low-carbon technologies) that are financed by progressive taxes or public debt and carbon taxes with strongly progressive use of revenues (such as cash transfers to the poorest or vulnerable households).[2] They also include regulations rather than corrective taxes in some settings (such as bans on polluting vehicles from city centers or dense areas and the mandatory insulation of buildings), highlighting the perceived inequity of the "pay to pollute" principles.

[2]Vulnerable households are defined as low-income or constrained, e.g., living in areas with little public transportation.

Second, we show what type of information increases support for climate action. Compared with a control group who saw no video, respondents who saw the video documenting the impacts of climate change in the viewer's country increased their willingness to take privately costly 'real-stakes' actions, including donating to a deforestation cause and signing a petition to support more climate action. However, they did not substantially alter their views on public policies to reduce climate change. On the contrary, respondents who saw a video explaining how the three central policies work - their likely effects on emissions and their distributional implications - exhibit stronger support for these and related climate policies. The same goes for respondents who see both videos. Thus, information and explanations can bolster support for public policies, but only if they address people's main concerns. Information on the dangers of climate change alone without a corresponding explanation of policies' effectiveness and distributional implications has only limited impacts on policy support. Hence, the experimental findings causally confirm the importance of the abovementioned factors, which are most predictive of policy views.

Third, we highlight how personal socioeconomic characteristics, lifestyle, and energy usage correlate with policy views and the underlying reasoning about climate change. More educated and left-leaning respondents are generally more supportive of climate policies. Higher household income is only associated with stronger climate action support in some countries.[3] There are mixed patterns across countries concerning respondents' age; it is thus not the case that young respondents are systematically more favorable to climate policies. Support for climate policies is stronger among respondents whose lifestyle is more amenable to adapting to them. Thus, opposition to climate policies is strongly correlated with lower availability of public transportation, greater reliance on cars, and, to a lesser extent, higher gas expenses.

Furthermore, these respondent characteristics are also significantly correlated with beliefs about climate policy effectiveness and distributional impacts, not just the perceived impacts on one's household (self-interest). Nevertheless, predicting beliefs or policy views based on socioeconomic and lifestyle characteristics is challenging. In other words, we are not easily able to infer people's policy views or beliefs based on their age, country, gender, education, income, political leanings, or how much they rely on polluting sources of energy.

Related Literature. Our paper contributes to the growing empirical literature which seeks to explore the drivers of support for climate policies among voters and citizens. Whitmarsh and Capstick (2018) provide an overview of work on public attitudes toward climate change, and Drews and van den Bergh (2016) summarize the research on what determines support for climate policies. Bernauer and Gampfer (2015), McEvoy and Cherry (2016) and McGrath and Bernauer (2017) study how support for climate policies depends on internationally coordinated action. Overall, people support even unilateral action by their country. We confirm these results in a larger set of countries.

The literature largely focuses on carbon taxes in a developed economies context. Klenert

[3]Brazil, India, Indonesia, Italy, Poland, and Ukraine.

et al. (2018), Maestre-Andrés, Drews and van den Bergh (2019) and Carattini, Carvalho and Fankhauser (2018) offer comprehensive reviews of work on attitudes towards carbon taxes, and offer suggestions to improve its acceptability. Umit and Schaffer (2020) leverage the European Social Survey to highlight a widespread aversion to carbon taxes, correlated with respondents' reliance on fossil fuel energy and low political trust. All these papers highlight the importance of distributional and effectiveness concerns to explain opposition to carbon pricing. They show that people often reject carbon pricing because they perceive it as ineffective (Sælen and Kallbekken (2011) for Norway), misunderstand its costs and benefits (e.g., Thalmann (2004) for Switzerland; Jagers and Hammar (2009) for Sweden), perceive it to be regressive and costly for them (Brannlund and Persson (2012) for Sweden), or care about its distributional impacts as much as about its effectiveness (Dietz and Atkinson (2010) for the U.K.; Sommer, Mattauch and Pahle (2022) for Germany). Douenne and Fabre (2022) show that opposition to carbon pricing in France during the Yellow Vest movement was driven by misperceptions about how the policy would impact people and its effectiveness. In Sweden, Ewald, Sterner and Sterner (2022) show that fuel tax protesters have similar motivations to the rest of the population. Bergquist, Mildenberger and Stokes (2020) find that, in the U.S., linking climate policy to other economic and social reforms can mitigate the concern for distributional impacts and increase the support for carbon pricing. D'Acunto et al. (2022) study support for alternative forms of financing of climate change policies in Germany. After being informed that the rich contribute more to climate change than the poor, respondents' support for carbon taxes increases.

Closely related to our paper is the work by Carattini et al. (2017) in Switzerland (see also Baranzini and Carattini (2017)). The authors study voting behavior in a large ballot on energy taxes and find (as we do) that concerns around distributional consequences and effectiveness are key determinants of voting. They also use a survey experiment to test the acceptability of alternative designs of the carbon tax. Similarly, Mildenberger et al. (2022) show (in Canada and Switzerland) that providing information on the rebate people can receive from carbon tax revenues increases support by correcting misperceptions, although attitudes are mostly determined by one's political identity.

In sum, several papers show that providing information can improve support for climate policies (mainly carbon taxes) but, contrary to our paper, they focus on a single knowledge gap in one specific country and do not study what type of information people lack most. Our finding that explaining policies' characteristics to respondents can shift their attitudes toward climate policies contributes to the ongoing discussions surrounding the importance of information in this area (e.g., Boon-Falleur et al. 2022; Kahan 2015; Sunstein et al. 2017).

In comparison to carbon taxes, the literature looking at other climate policies explored in our paper (e.g. bans, regulations, standards) that are much more prevalent in practice is limited. An example is Tarduno (2020) who studies Nevada's renewable portfolio standard and leverages an information experiment around a real-world vote. He finds that voting is relatively responsive to perceived policy effectiveness.

There have been several recent data collection initiatives across multiple countries by national or international organizations (the United Nations (UNDP 2021), Electricite de

France (EDF) and Ipsos (Ipsos 2020), the Pew Research center Stokes, Wike and Carle (2015)), and by researchers surveying Facebook users in 30 countries (Leiserowitz et al. 2021), but they do not focus on policies, contrary to our paper.

While our paper does not carry out a contingent valuation study, we also analyse willingness to adopt climate-friendly behaviors (at the individual level), which is conceptually distinct from supporting public climate policies. Related work by Bernard, Tzamourani and Weber (2022) shows that receiving information about ways to reduce CO_2 emissions increases individuals' willingness to pay for voluntary CO_2 offsetting. Andre et al. (2021) study the behavioral determinants of the willingness to fight climate change – as measured through an incentivized donation decision – in a large representative sample of U.S. adults. Predictors of climate change behavior include beliefs about social norms, patience and altruism, and universal moral values. An experiment shows that correcting the underestimation that many respondents have about the extent to which fellow citizens exhibit climate-friendly behaviors and norms improves their willingness to adopt climate-friendly behaviors. The importance of higher-order beliefs (beliefs about others' beliefs) and social norms is also emphasized in Mildenberger and Tingley (2019), Carattini, Levin and Tavoni (2019) and Bolsen, Leeper and Shapiro (2014). We do not study norms directly, but similarly find that citizens are more willing to adopt climate-friendly behaviors if others – particularly the rich – adopt them. However, across all countries, respondents also flag financial constraints as a major hurdle to the adoption of more climate-friendly behaviors.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the data collection, the sample, and the questionnaires. The subsequent sections present our main results: Section 3 focuses on knowledge about and attitudes toward climate change; Section 4 describes the support for policies across respondents and countries; Section 5 analyzes the beliefs and reasoning about the main climate policies covered and studies the factors that shape support for climate change action; and Section 6 presents the experimental results and the causal effect of information on policy views and attitudes. The Online Appendix provides additional information on the survey and analyses, as well as country-by-country results.

2 The survey

2.1 Survey data collection and sample

Data collection. We collected our survey data between March 2021 and March 2022 using the survey companies *Dynata* and *Respondi*. The survey companies maintain panels of respondents and send survey links to panelists with targeted socioeconomic characteristics. The companies also reward the respondents who fully complete the survey with compensation of varying amounts and forms, including cash, donations to charities, and loyalty programs points at partner companies. Excluding inattentive respondents that failed our attention check questions or who completed the survey too fast (as explained below), our main analysis sample has 40,680 respondents (between 1,465 and 2,488 respondents per country).

We first channel respondents through screening questions that ensure that the final sample is nationally representative along the dimensions of gender, age, income, region, and area of residence (urban versus rural). Appendix A-2.1 provides more details on our sampling procedure. For more information on online surveys, including recruitment, rewarding, and comparisons of online samples to other types of samples, see Stantcheva (2022).

Sample. Tables 1-5 show that our sample is relatively representative in high-income countries. One dimension in which our sample differs from the population in some countries is education: In Italy, Japan, South Korea, and Spain, the share of college-educated respondents in our sample is 15 to 25 percentage points higher than in the population. This is common in online survey samples (see Alsan et al. (2021), Stantcheva (2021), and Stantcheva (2022)).

In middle-income countries (Brazil, China, India, Indonesia, Mexico, South Africa, Turkey, and Ukraine), we faced constraints due to the online nature of the survey and the pandemic-related restrictions on door-to-door surveys. College-educated people are overrepresented, and respondents aged 50 and older or living in rural areas tend to be underrepresented. Indeed, these types of respondents are always hard to reach in countries with similar characteristics. For these countries, the results should therefore be interpreted with caution, as they do not accurately reflect the attitudes of the population at large but rather those of the "online population," which tends to be skewed toward the middle and upper classes, residing mainly in urban areas.

Throughout the paper, we re-weighted the samples within each country along the dimensions of gender, age, income, region, urbanity, education, and employment.[4]

Data quality. We took several steps to ensure the best possible data quality. Native speakers translated and reviewed the survey into the main national languages of each country and ensured that it was in line with local context and understanding.

On the introductory consent page, we appeal to people's social responsibility by asking them to answer carefully and honestly. We also warn them that we would withhold monetary compensation if their answers did not pass our quality checks, which is reinforced by the quality checks of the survey companies (of which respondents are aware). We record the time spent on different blocks and the survey overall. The median completion time is 28 minutes (see Appendix A-2 for the entire distribution of survey times).

We also added a question to screen out inattentive respondents. The representative samples (as shown in Tables 1-5) are obtained after excluding inattentive respondents who failed the attention check question (N=9,858, i.e. 18% of respondents) and those who rushed to complete the survey in less than 11 minutes (N=8,642, 16% of respondents). In total, because there is an overlap between those who rushed and those who failed the attention question, we end up excluding 25% of all respondents (N=13,632) who started the survey. We show in Appendix A-6.2 that our results are robust to the inclusion of these 25% of

[4]We trim weights so that no respondent receives a weight below 0.25 or above 4. Overall, trimming changes the weights for 3% of the respondents in high-income countries and 19% in middle-income countries.

respondents and robust to dropping respondents who took less than 20 minutes to complete the survey (a more stringent cutoff).

In Appendix A-6.3, we detail attrition at each step, and we test for differential attrition in Table A21. 12% of respondents (N = 8,689) drop out during the socioeconomic background questions, i.e., very early on, before they know anything about the topic of the survey. Hence, they are not dropping out differentially based on their interest in and views on climate change. 11% of respondents (N = 7,123) drop out at some point during the actual survey. Women, younger, lower-income, and less educated respondents are more likely to drop out, but the differences in attrition rates are not large.

Ex post, we checked that there were only a few careless response patterns (such as choosing the same answer for all items in a matrix of questions; see Appendix A-2.2). At the end of the survey, we ask whether respondents thought that our survey was politically biased and provide some feedback. 74% of the respondents found the survey unbiased. 15% found it left-wing biased, and 11% found it right-wing biased.

Do Survey Responses Reflect Actual Behaviors? An important question is whether (self-reported) survey responses reflect respondents' true attitudes and behaviors. To check this, our survey contained two real-stakes questions which asked respondents to invest time and money to express their views: a donation and a petition question.

In the donation question, we inform respondents that they are automatically entered into a lottery to win $100 (or the equivalent in their local currency). Before they know whether they have won the lottery, they have to decide which share of their potential win, if any, to donate to the non-profit *Gold Standard*, which fights deforestation.

The second question asks the respondents whether they are willing to sign a petition for climate action (expressing the view that *"immediate action for climate change is critical"*) and is told that we will share information about the share of respondents who signed this petition with the government of their country. We also ask respondents for their willingness to pay a randomized amount (ranging between $10 to $1,000 in local currency equivalent) to fight global warming. While not a real-stakes question per se, this question elicits a money-metric measure of respondents' willingness to invest own resources to fight climate change.

Figure 3 shows that self-reported preferences are positively correlated with real-stakes behaviors. The figure shows the correlation between the real-stakes behaviors and two indices, measuring respectively, support for climate policies (defined in Section 6) and willingness to change one's own behaviors (defined in Section 3), conditional on individual socioeconomic characteristics and country fixed effects. While the specific components, behaviors, and attitudes will be covered in detail below, the main takeaway is that respondents who express stronger support for climate policies and a higher willingness to adopt climate-friendly behaviors are significantly more likely to donate to the reforestation cause, to sign a petition supporting climate action, to be willing to pay to fight global warming.

Figure 3: Do Survey Responses Reflect Actual Behaviors? Correlation between self-reported support and actual behaviors



Note: The figure shows the correlation between the indicator variables listed in each row and the "Support for main policies" index and "Willingness to change behaviors" index, controlling for country fixed effects and socioeconomic characteristics. *Willing to donate to reforestation cause* equals 1 if the respondent is willing to donate a share of the money prize to deforestation. *Willing to sign petition supporting climate action* equals 1 if the respondent is willing to sign a petition supporting climate action *Willing to pay to fight global warming* is equal to 1 if the respondent is willing to contribute annually a given amount to limit global warming to safe levels. This amount displayed to each respondent is randomly drawn from the following options (with conversion in local currency): \$10 / \$30 / \$50 / \$100 / \$300 / \$500 / \$1,000. We control for the amount displayed. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

2.2 The questionnaire

As shown in Figure 4, the questionnaire is structured in four parts, described below: questions on household characteristics, pedagogical video treatments, questions on climate change, and questions about views on climate policies. We kept the questionnaires as similar as possible across countries while allowing for some appropriate variations. For example, in some countries, we added questions about specific policies of relevance (e.g., a ban on deforestation in Brazil and Indonesia). We omit some inappropriate questions (e.g., heating expenses in tropical countries or cattle-related policies in India). Finally, necessary adjust-

ments were made to country-specific figures and examples (e.g., the gasoline price increase implied by a carbon tax). Appendix A-5 provides the full questionnaire as well as links to each country's questionnaire in the original language.

Figure 4: Survey outline



Household characteristics. We ask the respondents about their basic socioeconomic and demographic information, including their age, income, gender, zip code, type of area of residence (i.e., size of their city), household composition, the highest level of education achieved, occupation, wealth, and whether they are homeowners. We measure political leanings through several questions: voting behavior in the latest national election, general interest in politics, leaning on economic policy issues, and interest and participation in environmental causes.

An important set of questions centers around energy usage and lifestyle as related to climate change. The answers to these questions allow us to assess how respondents may personally be affected by climate policies. We ask households about their housing characteristics (heating source and expenses and the quality of their home insulation), transportation (fuel expenditures, modes of transport used, availability of public transportation, frequency of flying), and beef consumption.

Information and Pedagogical Video Experiments. In the experimental part of the paper, we show respondents in randomly selected subsamples one or both of two videos. The "control group" sees no video. These treatments and the experimental results are described in Section 6.

Knowledge of and attitudes toward climate change. We measure the respondent's knowledge and understanding of climate change by asking a series of general and more technical questions. These include whether climate change is human-caused, which greenhouse gases (GHGs) contribute to it, and its possible impacts. We also ask respondents to rank different activities, modes of transportation, types of food, and world regions regarding GHG emissions.

Furthermore, we elicit respondents' attitudes on private climate action by asking how climate change affects their lifestyle, the extent to which they are willing to adopt different climate-friendly behaviors, and what factors would facilitate this adoption.

Views on climate policies. One of our core contributions is to elicit detailed reasoning about climate change policies. In the final block of the survey, we explore how respondents think about the three main climate policies explained in the videos (a ban on combustion-engine cars, an investment program in green infrastructure, and a carbon tax with cash transfers) and a range of other climate policies.

Importantly, rather than only asking respondents about their support for the main policies, we also elicit their perceptions about the policy's effectiveness in reducing emissions and changing behaviors, effects on the economy and employment, distributional impacts (which groups will lose or win?), impacts on their household (will they lose or win?), and fairness. We further ask them about variations related to the sources of funding (in the case of the green infrastructure program), how the revenue is spent (in the case of the carbon tax), and policy bundles (e.g., a ban on combustion-engine cars combined with public provision of alternative modes of transportation).

The set of policies we test is informed by the literature and the policy discussions. We intentionally do not limit the policies to only cover first-best instruments because of potential trade-offs between efficiency and social acceptability or political economy. In addition to the three main policies described above, we test several other policies.

First, we assess support for several variants of carbon taxes, which differ in how the revenues are earmarked. Second, we include several variants of bans on polluting cars, motivated by existing bans or restrictions for combustion-engine cars, for example, in Mexico City (Davis 2008), or cities across Germany (Wolff 2014). The third group of policies includes support for investments in low-carbon technologies and green infrastructures. Fourth, we elicit support for policies to reduce emissions from residential energy use.[5] Fifth, we test support for policies to reduce emissions from the agricultural sector, particularly cattle

[5]In the U.S. (Goldstein, Gounaridis and Newell 2020) and the E.U. (Eurostat 2020), households account for about 20% of total greenhouse gas emissions.

farming.[6] Furthermore, we also assess support for a tax on flights (increasing ticket prices by 20%).

In addition to self-reported policy support, we also ask two "real-stakes" questions requiring the respondent to incur a cost to express their support for climate action: a donation and a petition question, described in Section 2.1 and shown in Figure 3.

2.3 Outline of the analysis

We define all variables used and constructed in Appendix A-1. The descriptive statistics shown in Sections 3, 4, 5, and appendices are based on the control group sample only, i.e., respondents who see no pedagogical video. In the analysis, we usually correlate individual views and reasoning with two sets of individual covariates: i) individual socioeconomic characteristics (e.g., age, gender, or income) and ii) lifestyle and energy usage characteristics (e.g., car usage or heating source), "energy usage" for short. Whenever the effects of these covariates are relatively homogeneous across countries, we show only the coefficient on the pooled country sample (always including country fixed effects) and discuss possible heterogeneities. If patterns are heterogeneous, we directly show the coefficients in different countries. Our main results are shown separately for each country in Appendix A-4. Furthermore, we repeat the entire analysis for each country in the country-specific Online Appendices.

3 Knowledge and attitudes on climate change

This section describes respondents' knowledge and understanding of climate change.

3.1 Knowledge across countries

Few people outright deny the existence of climate change: the share is below 10% in most countries and around 12 or 13% in Australia, France, and the U.S. Most people believe that climate change is anthropogenic: one-third know that "most" (if not all) of it is due to human activity, and, depending on the country, 60% to 90% of respondents believe that human activity causes "a lot" or "most" of climate change.

Consequences of climate change. Most respondents (75-94%) correctly foresee some of the consequences of unabated climate change, such as severe sea-level rise or droughts and heatwaves (see Figure 5). At the same time, people do not seem to make a sufficient distinction between different types of disasters. For instance, most also believe that climate change will entail more frequent volcanic eruptions.

[6] Globally, livestock accounts for nearly 15% of greenhouse gas emissions, with beef and cattle milk production accounting for the majority of livestock emissions, contributing 41% and 20% respectively (Gerber et al. 2013).

Greenhouse gas emissions. Respondents are generally too optimistic about the level of decarbonization needed. One-half of respondents in high-income countries and more than two-thirds of respondents in middle-income countries incorrectly believe that cutting GHG emissions by half would suffice to stop global warming. Respondents are relatively well aware of the factors that cause climate change, especially in high-income countries. 80% correctly recognize that CO_2 is a greenhouse gas, 56% that methane is one, and 67% that particulate matter is not. Most of the classifications for different types of food and power generation in terms of GHG footprint are also correct. However, a non-trivial share of respondents, especially in middle-income countries, believe that nuclear power has a higher footprint than gas or coal.

The answers about transportation modes are less accurate, especially in countries where the difference in emissions between trains and cars is smaller because of the lack of electrified railways. We ask respondents to imagine a family journey between two large cities in their country and rank the possible modes of transportation according to their greenhouse gas emissions. The options are *Plane*, *Car*, and *Train* (or *Bus*, depending on whether bus or train is the most commonly used option for such journeys).[7] Respondents rank options more accurately in countries like Denmark or Germany, where trains are very low-carbon. They are less accurate in countries such as Indonesia or India, where trains are not unambiguously less carbon-intensive than the other options.

Ranking regions of the world by emissions. We also ask respondents to rank China, the U.S., the E.U., and India by total and per capita emissions.[8] Respondents rank regions and countries quite accurately in terms of total emissions. However, many overestimate the footprint of the average Chinese resident and underestimate that of the average European.[9]

3.2 Who has better knowledge?

To summarize a respondent's knowledge about climate change, we construct a *Knowledge index* that summarizes the variables mentioned above and increases the more accurate a respondent's answers are (see Appendix A-1). We construct all indices in the paper in the following three steps. First, we transform each underlying variable into a z-score (subtracting the control group mean and dividing by the control group standard deviation). Second, we take the average of the z-scores. Third, we standardize that average again by dividing it by its standard deviation. In Figure 6, we regress the *Knowledge index* on respondents' socioeconomic characteristics and variables that proxy for their energy usage.

[7] In countries such as Indonesia, where trains rely on coal, the environmental advantage of trains over cars is less clear. Respondents are thus asked about a family of two traveling 800 km from Surabaya to Jakarta instead of a family of four since a fully occupied car would be more efficient than the train. Featuring two passengers instead of four also blurs the comparison between the GHG footprint per passenger of a plane versus a car, as the two are comparable when there is only one passenger in the car.

[8] The respondent's country was also added for the GHG footprint, except for E.U. countries.

[9] The actual ranking for total emissions is China, the U.S., the E.U., and India. The true ranking for the per capita GHG footprint is as follows: U.S., E.U., China, and India. To avoid any systematic priming, we randomized the order in which countries/regions were displayed.

Figure 5: Knowledge about climate change across countries:
Share of correct answers



Note: Share of respondents who agree with the statements listed on the left. The statements represent the correct answer, according to the current scientific literature (see the sources in Appendix A-7). This figure only includes respondents in the control group only (who did not see any pedagogical videos). For the exact phrasing of each question, see Appendix A-5.

Across most countries, having a college degree is significantly associated with more accurate knowledge. Also consistent across many countries is that respondents with left-leaning economic views have more accurate perceptions than those with right-leaning views. On the other hand, women are generally less accurate, except in Australia, South Korea, Turkey, the U.K., Ukraine, and the U.S. (where there are no apparent differences by gender), in particular, because they tend to perceive more negative potential impacts of climate change (which are not always accurate, such as more frequent volcanic eruptions). The association between income and knowledge, conditional on education, is either significantly positive or insignificant, except in China (see Table A1).

The effect of age varies across countries (see Figure 6): age is positively correlated with knowledge in most countries (Australia, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Spain, Poland, India, Turkey, Ukraine, the U.K., and the U.S.), but the correlation is negative in South Korea, and insignificant in the remaining countries. Finally, respondents living with young children are somewhat less accurate too.

Figure 6: Who has better knowledge about climate change?

(A) Correlation between knowledge (*Knowledge index*) and socioeconomic characteristics



(B) Heterogeneous effects of age across countries



Note: Panel A shows the coefficients from an OLS regression of the *Knowledge index* on indicators for individual socioeconomic characteristics. Country fixed effects, treatment indicators, and age are included. The coefficients on age are displayed separately in Panel B for each country to highlight the heterogeneity. The omitted categories in Panel A are "man" for *gender* (*gender:* "other" is not displayed), lowest income quartile for *income*, "no schooling, or highest level achieved is primary or lower secondary education" for *education*; "left-leaning" for *economic leaning*. In Panel B, the omitted category is "18-34 years old" for *age*. The R^2 is 0.16. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

3.3 Expectations about climate change

Overall, expectations about the future are relatively bleak in high-income countries (see Panel A of Figure A3). Typically, less than 40% of respondents think that it is technically feasible to stop GHG emissions by the end of the century while maintaining satisfactory living standards or that it is likely that humans will halt climate change by the end of the century. Less than one-fifth of respondents in high-income countries think the world will be more prosperous than today in a hundred years. A substantial share of respondents feels that climate change, if nothing is done to limit it, could cause the extinction of humankind. Respondents in middle-income countries are more worried about the effects of unfettered climate change overall and on themselves; however, they are also more optimistic about humans' ability to halt climate change and the technical skills to do so while sustaining reasonable living standards.

The share of people who think climate change will affect their own life and humankind, in general, is systematically higher in countries that are more vulnerable to climate change, e.g., 72% in India compared to 16% in Denmark. Both these perceptions are positively correlated (conditional on a high-income country dummy variable) with the University of Notre Dame index of vulnerability to climate change (Chen et al. 2015). Thus, subjective beliefs about the impacts of climate change are related to the country's actual vulnerability (see Figure A2).

Within countries, certain groups tend to be more worried about unabated climate change: women, younger, more educated, and left-leaning respondents (see Panel B of Figure A3). Higher-income, college-educated, older, or left-leaning respondents are significantly more optimistic about humans' technical ability to halt climate change.

3.4 Willingness to adopt climate-friendly behaviors

Our paper focuses on people's understanding of and support for climate policies. However, climate action can also take the form of individual behavior changes, which are conceptually different. It is thus interesting to compare and contrast respondents' willingness to adopt climate-friendly behaviors with their support of public policies.[10]

Around half of the respondents say they are willing to purchase a fuel-efficient or electric vehicle and to limit flying, given current incentives (see Figure 7). Furthermore, except in Italy and India, respondents are generally unwilling to significantly limit their beef or meat consumption. Few are willing to limit driving or heating or cooling their homes by a lot.

We also asked people about their willingness to adopt these behaviors under different circumstances. The most important factors that would encourage people to adopt more climate-friendly behaviors are that they receive enough financial support to make these changes and that others, especially the most well-off, also change their behaviors.

[10]The indices "*Willingness to change behaviors*" (which aggregates all the variables depicted in Figure 7) and "*Support for climate policies*" (described in Section 6) are positively but not perfectly correlated (the correlation is 0.6), confirming that, while positively associated, support for public policies and willingness to take more private action given current policies and incentives are different.

Importantly, recall that Figure 3 showed that self-reported willingness to adopt climate-friendly behaviors is significantly positively correlated with being willing to take costly actions such as donating to a reforestation cause and signing a petition pushing for more climate action.

Figure 7: Share of respondents willing to adopt climate-friendly behaviors



Note: *Willingness to adopt climate-friendly behaviors* are answers to the question "*To what extent would you be willing to adopt the following behaviors?*" and *Factors that would encourage behavior adoption* correspond to answers to the question "*How important are the factors below in order for you to adopt a sustainable lifestyle (i.e. limit driving, flying, and consumption, cycle more, etc.)?*". Both questions use a 5-point scale: "*Not at all*", "*A little*", "*Moderately*", "*A lot*", and "*A great deal*". Depicted are the shares of respondents who answer "A lot" or "A great deal." Real-stakes questions include the signature of a petition to "stand up for real action" and an indicator equal to one if the respondents forfeit a share of their survey lottery prize of $100 in case they win the lottery. The shares represented are based only on respondents in the control group (who did not see any pedagogical videos).

4 Support for climate action across and within countries

This section describes support for climate policies across countries and respondents. One aspect that complicates such an analysis is that a given policy (e.g., a carbon tax) may generate different levels of support based on the bundle it is part of (e.g., a carbon tax with revenues used to fund low-carbon technologies). While it would be convenient to consider the tax side as separate from the revenue side, respondents' views on tax-based policies depend on the use of the revenue: Vice-versa, the source of revenues matters for policies requiring funding. Policy bundles are complicated to study because there are many different combinations. Our approach is, therefore, as follows. First, we provide evidence on several key policies. Second, we shed light on the possible uses of revenue in the case of carbon taxes, the sources of funding for the green infrastructure program, and policy bundles in the case of combustion-engine car bans. Third, in Sections 5 and 6, we analyze the fundamental factors shaping support for policies. This analysis can guide the evaluation and predict support for other combinations and types of policies.

Before diving into these results, it is worth remembering that Figure 3 showed that self-reported policy support is significantly correlated with willingness to engage in real-stakes behaviors such as donating to an environmental cause and signing a petition in support for climate change. This link bolsters confidence that the results presented next are informative about respondents' true attitudes toward climate policies.

4.1 Support for different types of policies

Support for subsidies to low-carbon technology adoption and infrastructure policies. Figure 8 shows marked differences in the support for distinct policies. Subsidies for low-carbon technologies and public investments in green technologies and infrastructures (financed by public debt) receive more than 55% support in high-income countries and more than 65% support in middle-income countries. There is equally high support for the mandatory and subsidized insulation of residential buildings across countries.

The source of funding clearly matters. Figure A6 shows the answers to the question about which sources of funding respondents would consider appropriate for public investments in green infrastructures. Respondents tend to agree that appropriate funding sources are higher taxes on the wealthiest and a carbon tax. They are much less likely to support additional public debt, reductions in social spending, reductions in military spending, or increases in sales taxes as appropriate sources of funding. These views are consistent with our results below that people care about policies' progressivity and effectiveness.

Bans on polluting vehicles. Many respondents also support banning polluting vehicles in city centers or dense areas (60% in high-income countries and 71% in middle-income ones). In high-income countries, support is 20% lower (12 percentage points) for a ban on the sale of combustion-engine cars (even if alternatives such as public transportation would

be made available) and 28% lower for an outright ban on combustion-engine cars (with no improvement in alternatives specified). We highlight the importance of respondents' alternative transportation modes for supporting climate policies in Section 6. Furthermore, in EU countries, we also asked about an alternative policy, namely support for a monetary penalty (of either €10,000 or €100,000) for the purchase of combustion-engine cars.[11] Generalized bans generate consistently higher support than penalties (see Figure A5). Preference for bans and regulation over price mechanisms highlights some of the limits of the "polluters pay" principle, which people may deem unfair, as the richest can pay their way out of it. Bans, on the contrary, affect everyone.

Carbon taxes. At first glance, carbon taxes and especially taxes on fossil fuels appear to be among the least popular policies. Taxes on fossil fuels and carbon taxes with revenues used to fund equal transfers to everyone only generate 36-38% support in high-income countries and 48-61% support in middle-income ones. However, the use of revenue matters substantially. Carbon taxes with revenues used to fund environmental infrastructures, subsidize low-carbon technologies, or reduce income taxes benefit from around 70% higher support in high-income countries (for a level of support of around 55%) and 25% higher support in middle-income countries (70%), compared with a carbon tax with equal cash transfers. Similarly, we observe majority support for carbon taxes with transfers to the poorest or the most constrained households. On the contrary, carbon taxes used to reduce corporate taxes generate similarly low support as carbon taxes with equal transfers or as taxes on fossil fuels (for which the use of revenues is not specified).

Agriculture-targeted policies. Finally, policies that reduce cattle farming are ranked among the least popular in all countries. Bans on intensive cattle farming enjoy somewhat higher support than either the removal of subsidies for cattle farming or a high tax on cattle products overall (so that the price of beef doubles).

Support and opposition versus indifference. An important point when trying to map these survey findings to real-world support for a policy is that across the range of policies we test, around one-third of respondents state that they neither support nor oppose it. Figure A4 shows the share of respondents who support a policy out of all respondents who express either support or opposition (but not indifference). Although the ranking of policies and the relative cross-country patterns are unchanged, among non-indifferent respondents, a majority is in favor rather than against most policies. Figure A10 shows that women, respondents who are lower-income, with a lower degree of education completed, or politically center-leaning are more likely to be indifferent.

These patterns suggest that indifference to climate policies may be a critical aspect to consider. It is important to recognize that many citizens express a lack of opinion on these issues. This expression may reflect a lack of interest in the topic, lack of knowledge, or actual ambiguity and hesitation about climate action. In that sense, indifferent respondents may be

[11] The €10,000 penalty is in line with the current EU levels. We did not ask these questions in Denmark and France, where the survey was completed slightly earlier.

akin to "swing voters" and those whose views are most malleable. Their views could change if a policy is actually proposed or discussed, and they are asked to vote on it. Section 6 highlights the factors shaping people's support for various policies, which can be informative about what pieces of information are needed to sway people's views on average.

4.2 Cross-country comparisons

We have to be cautious about comparing *absolute* levels of support between high-income and middle-income countries, given the differences in sampling highlighted before.[12]

Overall, support for the three central policies considered is lowest in Germany, France, and Australia, followed by Denmark, Japan, the U.S., and, to some extent, the U.K and Poland. Italy, South Korea, Spain, and Canada stand out as having overall higher support and are on par with Brazil, South Africa, Turkey, and Ukraine (with the lowest support among middle-income countries). Mexico and Indonesia have higher levels of support, and support is almost consistently highest in India and China.

Support for the carbon tax (and its variations) is particularly low in Australia, Poland, Denmark, Germany, the U.K., and the U.S. Bans on combustion-engine cars see their lowest support in Denmark, France, Germany, and the U.S., and their highest support in India and China.

Cattle-related policies are unpopular in Japan, Turkey, Ukraine, South Africa, Australia, and Denmark. Support for green infrastructure programs, and carbon taxes used to fund environmental infrastructures or low-carbon technologies, are highest in Italy and middle-income countries, especially in Brazil, China, Indonesia, Mexico, and South Africa. In Brazil and Indonesia, 75 to 79% of respondents support a complete ban on deforestation enforced by strong sanctions.

Furthermore, although we focus on climate policies at the national level, when asked about the level at which climate policies should ideally be put in place, 73% to 93% of people choose the global level. Less than half of all respondents think that policies should be enacted mainly at the federal (or European), national (or state), or local levels.

4.3 Individual characteristics correlated with support for climate policies

To summarize support for climate policies, we construct a *Support for Main Climate Policies index* based on the three main policies studied (see Appendix A-1 for details).[13] In Figure 9, we regress the *Support for Main Climate Policies index* on the sets of individual socioeconomic and energy usage characteristics and country fixed effects (results for each of the three main policies separately are in Figure A7). Whenever the average effects are

[12] Although we control for country fixed effects, differences in context and other policies already in place may influence views heterogeneously among different groups of people. For instance, the *status quo* level of taxes may heterogeneously influence how much appetite there is for more taxation across different groups.

[13] In brief, the index is an equally-weighted average of the standardized variables measuring support for each of the three main policies, each coded from -2 ("Strongly oppose") to +2 ("Strongly support").

Figure 8: Share of respondents who support climate change policies (somewhat to strongly)



Note: Policy views are elicited on a 5-point scale "Strongly oppose," "Somewhat oppose," "Neither support nor oppose," "Somewhat support," and "Strongly support." The figure shows the share of respondents to answer "Somewhat support" or "Strongly support" (see Figure A4 for support conditional on excluding indifferent respondents who "Neither support nor oppose"). The shares represented are based on respondents in the control group only (who did not see any pedagogical videos). For the exact phrasing of each question, see Appendix A-5.

relatively homogeneous across countries, we do not discuss country heterogeneity specifically (all results are in Tables A5-A6). For unconditional shares of support for the three main policies broken down by respondent characteristics, see Figures A8 and A9.

Individual characteristics. Figure 9 shows that political leaning is one of the strongest predictors of views on climate action: in most countries, left-leaning respondents are more supportive of climate action. The exceptions are China, Indonesia, Mexico, and Ukraine.

In most countries, college-educated respondents are more likely to support climate action (Australia, Brazil, China, Denmark, Indonesia, India, Italy, Mexico, Spain, Turkey, the U.K., and the U.S.). Income has mixed effects, as illustrated in Panel B. Higher-income respondents are more supportive of climate action in Brazil, India, Indonesia, Italy, Poland, and Ukraine. There are no clear patterns by income for the other countries. Age also has mixed effects. Older respondents in China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Poland, South Korea, and

Turkey are more supportive of climate action. However, in the online-representative samples, older respondents (especially those above 65 years old) represent only a small and possibly selected share of the population. Younger respondents are more likely to support climate policies in some high-income countries such as Australia, France, and the U.S. There is no significant heterogeneity by age in other E.U. countries or the U.K. In addition, respondents who live with children below the age of 14 are more supportive of climate policies.

Lifestyle and energy usage factors. Access to public transportation exhibits one of the strongest correlations with support for climate policy; the correlation is insignificant only in China, Japan, Mexico, and Ukraine. Conditional on access to public transportation, those who live in a large urban area have higher policy support only in Denmark, the U.K., and the U.S., but not in most countries. Thus, the availability of public transport seems to be the first-order concern related to the area of residence. For all high-income countries except the U.S., using a car regularly is associated with lower support for climate action. However, in China, India, and Indonesia, car usage is positively associated with policy support, conditional on income (see Figure A7 for detailed cross-country heterogeneity in the effect of car usage). Conditional on car usage, high gas expenses matter only marginally in Canada, Denmark, Germany, Italy, and Mexico. Frequent flyers tend to support more climate action overall, except for a tax on flying (see Figure A11). Respondents who consume beef at least weekly are less likely to support climate policies in Australia, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, and Spain.

Figure A11 shows the correlations between support for a range of other climate policies and individual characteristics. They are overall similar to the ones described for the main policies. Car-dependent respondents are less supportive of bans on polluting cars (whether those are overall bans, with enhanced alternatives, or limited to densely populated areas). They also exhibit lower support for taxes on fossil fuels and carbon taxes with cash transfers (only in Australia, France, Japan, Poland, and the U.K., see Figure A7). They do not have different views on taxes on flying, green infrastructure programs, subsidies for low-carbon technologies, or mandatory and subsidized insulation of buildings. Homeowners and landlords are less supportive of mandatory insulation but not less supportive of other climate change actions.

Can policy views be explained by socioeconomic and lifestyle characteristics? An important question is how much of the variation in policy views we can predict using these observable socioeconomic and energy usage characteristics. The R^2 from the regression in Figure 9 is 0.18, and would be 0.09 omitting country fixed effects. It increases to 0.24 if we add a large set of interactions between the covariates (0.12 without country fixed effects). Thus, while there are meaningful differences within countries, it is difficult to predict policy views from observable socioeconomic and energy usage characteristics only. Put differently, based on observables, it is difficult to delineate specific groups for or against climate policies. We next turn to the beliefs that shape views on climate action.

Figure 9: Which respondents support climate action?

(A) Correlation between *"Support for main climate policies index"* and socioeconomic and energy usage characteristics



(B) Heterogeneous effects of gender, age, and income across countries



Note: Panel A shows the coefficients from a regression of the *Support for main climate policies* index on socioeconomic indicators (left panel) and energy usage indicators (right panel). In the right panel, we control for but do not display the coefficients on socioeconomic indicators. Country fixed effects, age, gender, income, and treatment indicators are included but not displayed. The R^2 is 0.18. The omitted category for *Place characteristics* is "Rural or very small agglomeration." See the notes in Figure 6 for a list of all omitted categories. Panel B reports the coefficients on being 50 years and older (relative to being aged between 18 and 34 years), being a woman (relative to being a man), and being in the top two quartiles of the income distribution (relative to being in the first quartile). See Appendix A-1 for more precise definitions of the variables.

5 Which factors shape support for climate policies?

In this section, we study respondents' understanding of climate policies, in particular, how they perceive the policies' effectiveness, economic effects, distributional consequences, and impacts on themselves. We then analyze to what extent these beliefs can predict policy support.

5.1 Perceived distributional and efficiency impacts across countries

Figure 10 summarizes how respondents think about the effects of the three main policies. We distinguish between high-income countries and middle-income countries and also consider China, India, and Indonesia separately because they exhibit significantly different patterns (for a country-by-country plot, see Figures A12 - A14).

Perceived environmental benefits. The environmental benefits of climate policies are largely acknowledged: in both high-income and middle-income countries, a majority of respondents agree that the three policies would reduce air pollution and GHG emissions. France ranks as the most pessimistic country regarding perceived effectiveness, followed closely by Germany and the U.S., and Denmark to a lesser extent. Most optimistic about effectiveness are respondents in India, Indonesia, Japan, and South Africa.

Respondents in high-income countries are somewhat divided about the behavioral effects of the policies, such as encouraging people to drive less or making greater use of public transportation. For instance, in Poland, South Korea, and Spain, more than 55% of respondents believe that a carbon tax would encourage people to drive less, but this share is only around 40% in France or Germany. By contrast, respondents in middle-income countries tend to believe in these behavioral effects.

Perceived economic effects. Few respondents think that climate policies will have positive impacts on the economy and employment, although this share is somewhat higher in middle-income countries. When asked about whether each of the policies is a cost-effective versus costly way to fight climate change, respondents rank a carbon tax as the most costly, followed by the green infrastructure program and the ban on combustion-engine cars. Perceived costs and negative economic impacts of the carbon tax are particularly high in the U.S., France, Denmark, the U.K., and Germany (in this order).

Perceived distributional impacts. In most countries, the three main policies are often considered regressive. In high-income countries, at most one-quarter of respondents believe that low-income earners, the middle class, and those living in rural areas would gain from a green infrastructure program or from a carbon tax with transfers. In contrast, around 40% of respondents believe that high-income earners will experience a net positive gain from these three policies. Note that we do not attribute too much importance to the absolute share of respondents who believe that a given group will benefit from climate policies but rather to the relative shares who think poorer versus richer people will gain.

In middle-income countries (other than China, India, and Indonesia), respondents perceive the distributional impacts of the green infrastructure program more positively, but they are still wary of the possible effects of a carbon tax and combustion-engine bans on low-income, rural, and middle-class households. In India, Indonesia, and China, these patterns are quite different, and respondents are substantially less likely to consider the three main policies as regressive. The share of respondents who think that policies will benefit high-income households is generally smaller than the share who think they will benefit lower-income households, especially for the carbon tax with transfers.

Perceived impacts on one's household. Overall, respondents are similarly pessimistic about the financial effects of the three policies on their households as they are about their impact on middle-class or rural families. Less than one-fifth of respondents in high-income countries think their household would financially gain from these policies. Respondents in middle-income countries are somewhat more optimistic about the effects on their households, and respondents in China, India, and Indonesia are significantly more optimistic.

In summary, many respondents see these three key policies as environmentally effective but regressive and against their financial interests.

5.2 How do different groups of respondents reason about climate policies?

Figure 11 regresses the perceived effectiveness, distributional impacts, and own impacts of the main policies on individual socioeconomic and lifestyle indicators and country fixed effects.[14]

Higher-income respondents are more optimistic about the policies' effectiveness in reducing emissions. Respondents with young children are less likely to think that they will personally lose from these policies or that the policies are regressive.

Age has mixed effects. In middle-income countries, older respondents tend to be more likely to believe that policies reduce emissions and less likely to think that they or low-income earners will lose. In some high-income countries (Australia, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, the U.K., and the U.S.), older respondents are more likely to think they or low-income earners will lose. Gender typically has small and insignificant effects.

Although not consistently significant, having a college degree is associated with more optimism about the effectiveness of policies in reducing emissions and less pessimism about the impact on oneself and lower-income households.

In high-income countries, there is a clear political gradient for most perceptions: Left-leaning respondents are likelier to believe that policies will have positive economic impacts and reduce emissions and less likely to believe that high-income or low-income earners would lose. Differences by political leaning are usually not significant in middle-income countries.

[14]For unconditional average perceptions by socioeconomic group, see Figures A15-A16.

Figure 10: Perceived characteristics of the main policies



Note: The questions on effectiveness and fairness have answer options *Strongly disagree/Somewhat disagree/Neither agree nor disagree/Somewhat agree/Strongly agree*. We report the share of respondents who answer "Somewhat agree" or "Strongly agree." Questions on the distributional impacts and self-interest have answer options *Lose a lot/Mostly lose/Neither win nor lose/Mostly win/Win a lot*. Depicted is the share of respondents who say "Mostly win" or "Win a lot." "Support main climate policies" has answer options *Strongly oppose/Somewhat oppose/Neither support nor oppose/Somewhat support/Strongly support*. We show the share of respondents who "Somewhat support" or "Strongly support." The shares represented are based only on respondents in the control group (who did not see any pedagogical videos). For the exact phrasing of each question, see the Questionnaire in Appendix A-5.

Some lifestyle and energy usage characteristics are strongly correlated with a more positive outlook on the policies' effectiveness, progressivity, and own financial impacts. These include having public transportation available, being a frequent flyer, not being car-dependent, and not having high gas expenses (conditional on car usage).[15]

As was the case for policy views, the set of socioeconomic and energy usage characteristics and country fixed effects (including a large set of interactions of these variables) can only explain around 16% of the variation in perceptions about policies' effectiveness, 26% of perceived impact on low-income households, and 25% of the own perceived impact, with country fixed effects accounting for about half of all the variation explained. Therefore, these individual characteristics are important in shaping reasoning but are not the whole story.

[15]We define having high gas expenses as expenses above the median of the respondent's income group. However, the results are not sensitive to this definition.

Figure 11: How different groups perceive the effectiveness and distributional effects of the three main climate policies



Note: The figure shows the coefficients from two regressions. In the left panel, the indices listed along the vertical axis are regressed on indicator variables for socioeconomic characteristics and country fixed effects and treatment indicators (not shown). In the right panel, the same indices are regressed on energy usage indicators, country fixed effects, treatment indicators, and socioeconomic characteristics (not shown). Each index is constructed by averaging the z-scores of the answers to a given question (e.g., "believes policies would have economic effects") across all three main policies and standardizing again. See Appendix A-1 for more detailed variable definitions. See the notes to Figure 9 for a list of the omitted categories.

Interestingly, respondents' perceptions of their own gains and losses are significantly correlated with and predicted by socioeconomic and energy usage characteristics, but the prediction is imperfect. Thus, respondents' perceived threat from climate policies depends on more than just these factors.

5.3 Factors predicting policy support

To determine which beliefs are correlated with support for climate policy, we regress support for each of the three main climate policies on the respondents' socioeconomic characteristics and on a set of standardized variables and indices measuring beliefs about climate change and climate policies. The results are shown in Panel A of Figure 12.[16] Panel B

[16]For country-by-country results, see Tables A8 and A9.

reports the share of the variance in support for the three policies (as summarized by the *Support for Climate Policies index*) that is explained by each variable.[17] Overall, 70% of policy views are explained by these beliefs and socioeconomic and lifestyle characteristics, compared to 24% explained by individual characteristics only.

First, the perceived distributional impacts of climate policies are strongly correlated with policy support. Most important (in terms of the share of variation explained) is the perceived effectiveness of a policy, as measured by the belief that it will reduce emissions and the belief that it will reduce pollution. Beliefs in the effectiveness of policies to reduce emissions and pollution together account for 24% of differences in policy support.

Second, self-interest is also important: those who think they will themselves lose from a given policy are much less likely to support it. This belief alone explains 15% of the variation in policy views. Related to self-interest, the belief that one will suffer from climate change accounts for 4% of differences in policy support.

Third, the perceived progressivity of a policy also matters substantially: respondents who believe that low-income earners will lose are less supportive of the policy. In a few countries (France, India, Indonesia, Spain, Turkey, and Ukraine) the belief that the high-income earners will lose is even positively associated with support for it (see Tables A8-A9). Across countries, the belief that poor people will lose from climate policies accounts for 8% of the variation in policy views. Furthermore, there is a close connection between the respondent believing that a policy is "fair" and supporting it (the raw correlation between these variables is 0.89).

Broader perceived economic effects or concerns about the impacts of climate change overall are not as strongly correlated with policy support. Believing that a policy will positively impact the economy is associated with slightly higher policy support. Similarly, knowledge about climate change is a weak predictor of support for climate policies, although there is a small significant effect of the belief that climate change is human-made.[18]

Support for climate policies and individual willingness to change behavior are not driven by the same beliefs. Compared to support for public policy action, respondents' willingness to privately adopt climate-friendly behaviors is much more driven by concerns about the consequences of climate change and that they would suffer from the main climate policies (see Figure A17). It is less correlated with perceptions of the efficiency or distributional impacts of those policies.

[17] We follow Grömping (2007) and Lindeman, Merenda and Gold (1980). To overcome the dependency of a simple ANOVA on the order of the covariates in the regression, this method averages ANOVAs over all permutations of the covariates.

[18] Overall, our results across 20 countries confirm some of the patterns observed for specific countries, as discussed in the introduction, where the importance of perceived fairness, effectiveness, and self-interest has been highlighted (Carattini, Carvalho and Fankhauser 2018; Douenne and Fabre 2022; Klenert et al. 2018).

Figure 12: Beliefs underlying support for the main climate policies

(A) Correlation between support for the three main policies and beliefs



(B) Share of the variation in *Support for main policies* explained by different beliefs



Note: Panel A shows the coefficients from a regression of support for each policy (indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent supports the policy somewhat or strongly) on standardized variables measuring respondents' beliefs and perceptions. Country fixed effects, treatment indicators, and individual socioeconomic characteristics are included but not displayed. The R^2 is 0.7. Panel B depicts the share of the variance in the *Support for main policies* index that is explained by each belief and perception, conditional on country fixed effects. We use the LMG method (see Grömping 2007) for the variance decomposition. See Appendix A-1 for detailed variable definitions.

6 Experimental results: the causal effects of information

This section presents the results from the experimental part of the paper, which showed respondents information about climate change and climate policies using videos. This experimental variation allows us to establish the causal effects of specific types of information. It also serves to causally confirm the importance of the factors which were shown to be most predictive of policy views in Section 5.

6.1 The information treatments

We show respondents in randomly selected subsamples one or both of two pedagogical videos (see the survey flow in Figure 4). The "control group" sees no video. The *Climate impacts* video, which is 2-3 minutes long, centers on the impacts of climate change, with information that is tailored to the country of the respondent. The *Climate policies* video (5 minutes long) focuses on three major climate policies and is also adapted to each country's specifics.[19] The objective of these treatments is to understand how perceptions change after receiving salient information on the effects of climate change or climate policies and how these perceptions and beliefs causally translate into policy support. Appendix A-5 contains the scripts and links to the videos; Appendix A-7 contains the data sources used. Table A22 shows that our treatment assignment is balanced across socioeconomic and energy usage characteristics.

The video on *Climate impacts* starts by explaining that climate change is anthropogenic and is likely to have adverse impacts on the respondent's country if nothing is done to reduce it. Some of the impacts presented include more severe heatwaves, frequent forest fires, and a growing number of areas at risk of being permanently flooded due to sea-level rise (see Panel A in Figure 13).[20] The video concludes that reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions is necessary to tackle climate change.

The video on *Climate policies* focuses on the three significant climate policies studied in-depth in the survey and describes some of their advantages and drawbacks. Importantly, the policies covered are not first-best policies but rather realistic alternatives already adopted in some shape or under discussion in many countries. We also do not only highlight the positive aspects of these policies. Instead, we describe their costs as well as their benefits.

First, the video presents a ban on the production and sale of new combustion-engine cars that emit more than a given (time-varying) threshold of CO_2 per kilometer.[21] The threshold is progressively lowered so that only electric (or hydrogen) vehicles can be sold by 2030.

[19] Because we compute all descriptive statistics using the control group, we made it 25% larger than the other groups. It contains 29.4% of the sample, while the three treatment branches each contain 23.5% of the sample.

[20] In Canada and Denmark, we also mention potential positive effects on crop production.

[21] This policy is similar to fuel economy standards that have been implemented in many countries, including the U.S., the European Union, China, and India (Anderson and Sallee 2016)

Figure 13: Select Screenshots from the pedagogical videos

(A) Climate impacts video



Today, the concentration of CO2 in the atmosphere is higher than any time over the last 800,000 years.



Air pollution caused by the burning of fossil fuels is already responsible for 6 million annual deaths worldwide.

In the North-East, the risk of heavy rain has already increased by 55%.

(B) Climate policies video



For example, the price of gasoline would increase by 40 cents per gallon.

To compensate people for the higher prices, the revenues of the carbon tax would be redistributed to all households, regardless of their income.



Does this policy work? Yes! The Canadian province of British Columbia has a carbon tax with cash transfers since 2008.

The video also alerts respondents that electric vehicles may have a lower range and be more expensive.

Second, the video describes a carbon tax with cash transfers. We directly tell the respondents about the increase in the implied price of gasoline in local currency (e.g., \$0.40 per gallon in the U.S. and €0.10 per liter in France).[22] The video explains that the tax makes fossil fuels more expensive. Hence, companies and individuals are likely to reduce their fossil fuel consumption and, thus, CO_2 emissions. It also informs the respondents about the cash transfer per adult that the tax revenues can finance (see Appendix A-7.1.1 for the computations). Furthermore, the video explains that equally redistributing the revenues across all people means that low-income earners will, on average, receive more cash transfers than they pay in taxes. The reverse holds for high-income earners (see Panel B in Figure 13). Therefore, the video clarifies the progressivity of such a scheme, which, as we showed in Section 5, needs to be better understood.

Third, the video discusses the effects of an extensive public investment program in green infrastructure in transportation, energy, building insulation, and agriculture financed by additional public debt. It estimates the number of jobs created in non-polluting sectors and jobs lost in polluting sectors.[23] Finally, the video reminds respondents that, although it focuses on three essential policies, many others could be useful and needed to combat climate change.

6.2 Treatment effects on support for climate policies

Figure 14 depicts the effects of the video treatments on the pooled (all countries) sample.[24] These treatment effects largely confirm the correlations outlined in Section 5 about which factors matter most for policy support.

In the cross-country pooled data, the *Climate impacts* treatment has the smallest effects on support for each of the policies. It is statistically significant in very few individual countries. The effects of the *Climate policies* treatment are much stronger, especially on support for the carbon tax with cash transfers and, to a lesser extent, for the ban on combustion-engine cars. The strongest impacts are found for the combination of the *Climate impacts* and *Climate policies* treatments, which are roughly equal to the sum of the two treatments' impacts. The treatment effects are largest for the carbon tax with cash transfers, followed by the ban on combustion-engine cars and the green infrastructure program. All three treatments have significant and large effects on the perceived fairness of the three policies.

[22] Implicitly, we use a price of carbon \$45 per ton of CO_2, close to estimates of the social cost of carbon in Marron and Maag (2018), as explained in Appendix A-7.1.1

[23] Economists have advocated for green infrastructure investment programs for many years to accelerate the transition towards a low-carbon economy (Hepburn et al. 2020; High Level Commission on Carbon Prices 2017). Over the past years, many governments have started to launch such programs, including the E.U.'s Green Deal (EC 2019) and programs adopted in the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic, such as the Next Generation E.U. fund (EC 2020) and the U.S. Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (US Congress 2021).

[24] For treatment effects by country, see Tables A11-A12. For the shares of support for all policies by treatment group, see Figure A18.

Support for the green infrastructure program has the highest baseline level and sees the smallest treatment effects among the three policies. The combination of the *Climate impacts* and *Climate policies* treatments increases support for it in Australia, Canada, China, Denmark, Indonesia, South Africa, Spain, and the U.K., and the treatment effect represents on average 13% of the control group's support in these countries. However, because baseline support is high, the apparently small treatment effect is equivalent to 53% of the share of those who oppose the program in the control group for the high-income countries listed.

Turning to the ban on combustion-engine cars, the *Climate policies* treatment alone is significant only in a few countries (Australia, France, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, and South Africa). The combined treatment has significant effects in the pooled sample of all countries and in Australia, Brazil, China, Denmark, France, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Mexico, South Africa, Spain, Turkey, and the U.K. In those countries, the effect of the combined treatment is equivalent to 21% of the control group mean on average, ranging from 7% in Indonesia (which starts with a high level of baseline support) to 43% in Australia. The treatment effect size is also equivalent to 55% of the share who oppose the policy in the control group and to 36% of the gap in support between left- and right-wing respondents in the above-listed countries.

Finally, regarding the carbon tax with transfers, the *Climate policies* treatment increases support significantly in all countries except Mexico. The magnitudes correspond to 26% of the control group mean (ranging from 10% in China to 49% in Germany), 59% of the share who oppose this program, and on average to 58% of the gap between left- and right-wing respondents in countries where it is significant. The combination of the *Climate impacts* and *Climate policies* treatments have even stronger effects in all countries (except Canada, Germany, India and Poland). The effects are equivalent to 35% of the control group mean (ranging from 8% in India to 65% in Denmark) and to 61% of the opposition in countries where the effect is significant.

Heterogeneity in treatment effects. We systematically explored potential heterogeneous treatment effects by socioeconomic and lifestyle characteristics and did not find significant or systematic heterogeneity in treatment effects along these dimensions. Overall, the video treatments have a larger effect on policies that start with lower support and that have more room for improvement. They sway sizable shares of respondents as benchmarked against the share who oppose each policy in the control group. The effects of the combined treatment are the strongest.

Treatment effects on support for other policies. There are significant treatment effects on support for policies other than our main ones as well, especially those that are the most closely related. The *Climate policies* and the combined treatment both significantly increase support for carbon taxes under all revenue usage scenarios (see Figure A19). These two treatments also significantly increase support for the simple tax on fossil fuels without transfers (with an effect size equal to around 30% of the control group mean) and a tax on flying, presumably because it is also associated with reducing fuel usage (see Figure 14).

There are significant treatment effects on a ban on combustion-engine cars with alterna-

tives made available and on a ban on polluting cars in city centers, which are more popular than the simple ban on combustion engine cars, even after adjusting the p-values for multiple testing.[25] However, policies that are not closely related to the ones presented in the video, such as mandatory building insulation, do not have significantly higher levels of support in the treatment group compared to the control group.[26]

Private action versus public policy. The treatment effects on private behaviors, including on the real-stakes behaviors (donating to the reforestation cause and signing a petition supporting climate action) are substantially different from those on policy support. For these private behaviors, the *Climate impacts* video and the combined video have the strongest effects. These treatments significantly increase (at the 5% significance levels) the willingness to sign a petition, to adopt climate-friendly behaviors, and to donate a higher share of the prize money to the reforestation cause. Therefore, stronger concerns about the consequences of climate change can push respondents to take more (costly) private actions, including incurring time and financial costs during the survey. On the contrary, the *Climate policies* treatment generates demand for public policies, but not private action. These distinct patterns highlight, once again, that private behaviors and public policy support have different determinants. Furthermore, they suggest that the effects of the treatment videos are due to their specific information content rather than to simple priming about climate change.

6.3 Interpretation of the treatment effects

To interpret these treatment effects, consider Figure 15, which shows the treatment effects on a range of underlying beliefs.[27] The *Climate impacts* treatment increases concerns about climate change and improves understanding of it (e.g., that it is real and caused by humans and which GHGs and activities contribute to it). However, these beliefs were shown not to be strong predictors of support for new climate policies (as described above). This treatment does not shift the key mechanisms that matter for policy support, namely their perceived effectiveness, distributional impacts, and impacts on one's household. The *Climate policies* and the combined treatment shift exactly the beliefs that are most predictive of policy support, namely, the perceived impacts on others and oneself and the effectiveness of the policies. In particular, the share of respondents that believes low-income people will on net gain from a carbon tax with cash transfers jumps from 30% in the control group to 47% among those who saw the *Climate policies* video.

[25] We use the method by Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) to adjust the p-values on the coefficients of the treatment indicators for the ten policy support outcome variables.

[26] These patterns provide some reassurance that the treatment effects are not due to experimenter demand effect, whereby respondents infer that we (the experimenters) want them to express support for climate action; instead they suggest that only the specific aspects about which information has been provided are shifted by the treatments. This is further bolstered by the 'first-stage' effects on underlying beliefs in Figure 15.

[27] Although we do not use the treatment assignment as an instrumental variable, it can be helpful intuitively to think of these underlying perceptions and beliefs as "first-stage" variables and of the policy views as "second-stage" outcomes.

Thus, explaining how policies work and who can benefit from them (or how losers can be compensated) is critical to fostering policy support. Simply making people more concerned about climate change does not appear to be an effective strategy.

Furthermore, as shown in Figure 15 and Table A13, providing information significantly increases (by 2 to 7 p.p.) the belief that a goal of net-zero emission is achievable and that humankind will succeed in halting climate change by the end of the century. This suggests that the grim views about the future (documented in Section 3) may be driven by a lack of awareness of possible solutions, which can be addressed with the type of information provided in the videos.

In addition, as can be seen from the weaker effects on support for policies other than the ones covered in the videos, it is important to provide information about and explain the workings of a specific or closely related policy. Respondents do not immediately extrapolate one policy's effect to another.

Figure 14: Effects of the treatments on support for climate action



Note: The figure shows the coefficients from a regression of indicator variables and one continuous variable listed on the left, capturing support for various policies and willingness to change behaviors on indicators for each treatment, controlling for country fixed effects and socioeconomic characteristics (not shown). The exception is *% of prize willing to donate to reforestation cause*, which is a continuous variable from 0 to 1 equal to the share of the lottery prize the respondent is willing to donate. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

Figure 15: Effects of the treatments on underlying beliefs

(A) Effects of the treatments on trust, views about climate change, and knowledge



(B) Effects of the treatments on beliefs about properties of the main climate policies



Note: The figure depicts the 'first stage' effects of the treatments, i.e., on beliefs about climate change and climate policies (we do not use the treatments as instrumental variables but it is helpful intuitively to think of beliefs as first-stage variables and policy views as second-stage outcomes). It shows the coefficients from a regression of indices listed on the left, capturing respondents' beliefs and perceptions on indicators for each treatment, controlling for country fixed effects and socioeconomic characteristics (not shown). Panel A displays the coefficients from the regressions for reasoning, while panel B displays the coefficients from regressions of beliefs about the properties of each of the three policies. See Appendix A-1 for variable detailed definitions.

7 Conclusion

Our new large-scale international survey of 40,000 respondents across twenty high-emitting countries shows that a majority of people understand that climate change is real and human-caused. However, respondents disagree about which measures should be taken to fight it. Our paper contributes new and comprehensive data on people's perceptions and reasoning about climate change and climate policies across many countries. We also study which factors matter most for policy support and what type of information is most important to shift views on climate policies.

We show that people's support for a given climate policy depends on three fundamental beliefs, namely that the policy is helpful in reducing emissions (effectiveness); ii) does not have adverse distributional impacts by hurting lower-income households (inequality concerns); and iii) does not financially hurt the respondents' household (self-interest). Stronger concerns or better knowledge about climate change are not strong predictors of support for climate action.

Accordingly, in many countries, there is strong majority support for policies perceived to be effective, progressive, or both, namely green infrastructure programs, subsidies for low-carbon technologies, carbon taxes with strongly progressive use of revenues (such as cash transfers to the poorest or most impacted households), and policies centered around regulations such as bans on polluting vehicles from city centers or dense areas, and the mandatory insulation of buildings.

These findings are confirmed experimentally. Respondents who see a video explaining the effectiveness and distributional implications of a policy (e.g. that it will not hurt poorer households) significantly increase their support for climate policies. Respondents who see a video on the impacts of climate change instead do not change their views by as much, and the effect is only significant in a few countries. The treatment effects for the three main policies covered in the information treatments – a green infrastructure program, a ban on combustion-engine cars, and a carbon tax with cash transfers – differ in magnitude. But for all three policies, a significant share of the baseline opposition can be swayed by explanations of how the policies work and who they impact.

Left-wing and college-educated respondents, as well as those with public transport availability, low car usage, and gas expenses, are more supportive of climate action. The differences between groups that support more climate change action and those that support less can also be traced back to the three core beliefs outlined. For instance, college-educated respondents are generally more supportive of climate action because they believe that it will be effective in reducing emissions and that they or lower-income households will not lose out as much. Nevertheless, socioeconomic and lifestyle characteristics alone do not explain a large share of the variation in policy views across respondents.

The policy lessons emerging from these international surveys and experiments are, first, that the specific policies proposed need to be distributionally progressive and that citizens need to be made aware of this. A corollary is that carbon pricing can be widely supported, as long as it is accompanied by transfers to vulnerable households and low-carbon investments. In other words, effectiveness and progressivity can go hand in hand. Second,

explanations and information are needed to improve support for climate policies. They can be very effective in improving climate policies' support if they address the three key concerns outlined. Information on the dangers of climate change alone without a corresponding explanation of the policies has only limited impacts on policy support. Third, people have key concerns about their own potential losses from implementing climate action. Their own experience shapes their broader perceptions and beliefs about climate change and policies. This highlights the importance of making environmentally friendly alternatives, e.g., public transportation, more widely available before increasing environmental taxes.

Future research could continue shedding light on the best way to convey information on how climate policies work. In addition, while our sample includes a substantial number of countries, many more are missing and would be valuable to survey in an expanded analysis. Our survey has focused on mitigation rather than adaptation policies (Barreca et al. 2016), which would be valuable to explore in future work.

Table 1: Sample representativeness – High-income countries 1

	Australia		Canada		Denmark		France	
	Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample
Sample size	NA	1,978	NA	2,022	NA	2,013	NA	2,006
Man	0.49	0.56	0.49	0.45	0.50	0.50	0.48	0.44
18-24 years old	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.11	0.09	0.12	0.10
25-34 years old	0.19	0.19	0.17	0.14	0.16	0.12	0.15	0.15
35-49 years old	0.26	0.27	0.24	0.25	0.23	0.25	0.24	0.25
More than 50 years old	0.44	0.44	0.48	0.52	0.50	0.54	0.49	0.50
Income Q1	0.25	0.45	0.25	0.25	0.26	0.29	0.25	0.31
Income Q2	0.25	0.31	0.25	0.28	0.23	0.25	0.25	0.31
Income Q3	0.25	0.17	0.25	0.28	0.28	0.26	0.25	0.23
Income Q4	0.25	0.07	0.25	0.20	0.22	0.19	0.25	0.14
Region 1	0.33	0.30	0.07	0.06	0.32	0.30	0.19	0.19
Region 2	0.20	0.23	0.06	0.07	0.23	0.23	0.22	0.24
Region 3	0.07	0.10	0.26	0.23	0.10	0.10	0.20	0.22
Region 4	0.28	0.28	0.39	0.39	0.14	0.16	0.25	0.20
Region 5	0.11	0.09	0.23	0.24	0.21	0.21	NA	NA
Urban	0.72	0.76	0.83	0.89	0.53	0.53	0.60	0.59
College education (25-64)	0.49	0.46	0.60	0.56	0.36	0.44	0.40	0.42
Share of voters	0.72	0.86	0.56	0.83	0.76	0.89	0.70	0.78
Voters: Left	0.44	0.44	0.60	0.65	0.44	0.48	0.28	0.24
Voters: Center	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.09	0.06	0.24	0.12
Voters: Right	0.41	0.41	0.39	0.30	0.43	0.37	0.47	0.53
Voters: Other	0.15	0.08	0.01	0.00	0.04	0.03	0.01	0.02
Voters: Not reported	NA	0.06	NA	0.05	NA	0.06	NA	0.08
Inactivity rate (15-64)	0.22	0.22	0.23	0.29	0.21	0.28	0.29	0.25
Unemployment rate (15-64)	0.07	0.12	0.10	0.12	0.06	0.12	0.08	0.10
Employment rate (15-64)	0.73	0.69	0.70	0.63	0.74	0.63	0.65	0.67

Note: This table displays summary statistics of the samples alongside nationally representative statistics. For *College education (25-64)*, the sample statistics are provided for respondents aged between 25 and 64 years old. For the *Share of voters*, the sample statistics include the share of people who indicated having voted. For the *Voters* variables, the sample statistics include the share of respondents who indicated voted for a party/candidate classified in each category, among respondents who indicated having voted. The *Voters: Not reported* category includes people who indicated having voted but did not report the candidate/party they voted for. For *Inactivity rate (15-64)*, the sample statistics include the share of respondents aged between 15 and 64 years old who indicated being either "*Inactive (not searching for a job)*," a "*Student*," or "*Retired*." For *Unemployment rate (15-64)*, the sample statistics include the share of respondents aged between 15 and 64 years old who indicated being "*Unemployed (searching for a job)*", ('*Unemployed (searching for a job)*," "*Full-time employed*," "*Part-time employed*," or "*Self-employed*"). For *Employment rate (15-64)*, the sample statistics include the share of respondents aged between 15 and 64 years old who indicated being either "*Full-time employed*," "*Part-time employed*," or "*Self-employed*." Detailed sources for each variable and country, as well as the definitions of regions, college education, urban, and voting categories are available in Appendix A-7.

Table 2: Sample representativeness – High-income countries 2

	Germany		Italy		Japan		Poland	
	Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample
Sample size	NA	2,006	NA	2,088	NA	1,990	NA	2,053
Man	0.49	0.48	0.48	0.49	0.48	0.54	0.48	0.44
18-24 years old	0.09	0.06	0.08	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.09
25-34 years old	0.15	0.16	0.12	0.13	0.12	0.13	0.17	0.18
35-49 years old	0.22	0.22	0.24	0.26	0.24	0.27	0.28	0.30
More than 50 years old	0.54	0.56	0.56	0.52	0.56	0.53	0.46	0.42
Income Q1	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.28	0.25	0.27	0.25	0.22
Income Q2	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.28	0.25	0.27	0.25	0.27
Income Q3	0.25	0.23	0.25	0.23	0.25	0.27	0.25	0.27
Income Q4	0.25	0.27	0.25	0.21	0.25	0.19	0.25	0.25
Region 1	0.10	0.10	0.20	0.20	0.17	0.18	0.12	0.10
Region 2	0.15	0.16	0.11	0.12	0.18	0.19	0.14	0.13
Region 3	0.18	0.16	0.19	0.17	0.35	0.38	0.23	0.21
Region 4	0.29	0.27	0.27	0.30	0.11	0.10	0.29	0.33
Region 5	0.28	0.31	0.23	0.21	0.20	0.16	0.22	0.23
Urban	0.80	0.76	0.83	0.89	0.70	0.76	0.57	0.66
College education (25-64)	0.31	0.32	0.20	0.38	0.53	0.72	0.33	0.46
Share of voters	0.67	0.86	0.59	0.87	0.54	0.79	0.63	0.87
Voters: Left	0.41	0.42	0.24	0.31	0.29	0.22	0.02	0.06
Voters: Center	0.07	0.07	0.36	0.20	0.31	0.15	0.16	0.13
Voters: Right	0.49	0.40	0.39	0.32	0.35	0.44	0.81	0.76
Voters: Other	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.00	NA
Voters: Not reported	NA	0.06	NA	0.10	NA	0.14	NA	0.05
Inactivity rate (15-64)	0.21	0.23	0.36	0.19	0.20	0.22	0.29	0.18
Unemployment rate (15-64)	0.04	0.07	0.09	0.17	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.09
Employment rate (15-64)	0.76	0.72	0.58	0.67	0.77	0.74	0.69	0.75

Note: This table displays summary statistics of the samples alongside nationally representative statistics. See notes to Table 1. Detailed sources for each variable and country, as well as the definitions of regions, college education, urban, and voting categories are available in Appendix A-7.

Table 3: Sample representativeness – High-income countries 3

	South Korea		Spain		U.K.		U.S.	
	Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample
Sample size	NA	1,932	NA	2,268	NA	2,025	NA	2,218
Man	0.50	0.56	0.49	0.49	0.50	0.52	0.50	0.47
18-24 years old	0.10	0.09	0.08	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.12	0.12
25-34 years old	0.16	0.19	0.12	0.14	0.17	0.19	0.18	0.18
35-49 years old	0.27	0.31	0.28	0.29	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.25
More than 50 years old	0.47	0.40	0.51	0.48	0.49	0.48	0.46	0.45
Income Q1	0.25	0.27	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.27	0.20	0.26
Income Q2	0.25	0.28	0.25	0.27	0.25	0.25	0.24	0.28
Income Q3	0.25	0.32	0.25	0.23	0.25	0.21	0.24	0.26
Income Q4	0.25	0.13	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.27	0.31	0.20
Region 1	0.25	0.24	0.19	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.20
Region 2	0.34	0.37	0.30	0.28	0.13	0.13	0.17	0.18
Region 3	0.19	0.23	0.11	0.10	0.24	0.23	0.38	0.39
Region 4	0.22	0.17	0.13	0.15	0.11	0.10	0.24	0.23
Region 5	NA	NA	0.28	0.26	0.31	0.33	NA	NA
Urban	0.92	0.95	0.70	0.75	0.82	0.84	0.73	0.72
College education (25-64)	0.51	0.74	0.40	0.57	0.49	0.62	0.61	0.60
Share of voters	0.75	0.87	0.63	0.85	0.60	0.82	0.62	0.82
Voters: Left	0.47	0.63	0.41	0.45	0.39	0.37	0.51	0.57
Voters: Center	0.21	0.11	0.07	0.09	0.12	0.11	NA	NA
Voters: Right	0.31	0.17	0.36	0.25	0.46	0.47	0.47	0.36
Voters: Other	0.01	NA	0.16	0.14	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
Voters: Not reported	NA	0.09	NA	0.07	NA	0.03	NA	0.05
Inactivity rate (15-64)	0.31	0.17	0.28	0.18	0.21	0.24	0.27	0.26
Unemployment rate (15-64)	0.04	0.08	0.16	0.14	0.05	0.09	0.08	0.13
Employment rate (15-64)	0.66	0.76	0.62	0.71	0.75	0.69	0.67	0.64

Note: This table displays summary statistics of the samples alongside nationally representative statistics. See notes to Table 1. For *College education (25-64)* in the U.S., the sample statistics is provided for all respondents and not only respondents aged between 25 and 64 years old. Detailed sources for each variable and country, as well as the definitions of regions, college education, urban, and voting categories are available in Appendix A-7.

Table 4: Sample representativeness – Middle-income countries 1

	Brazil		China		India		Indonesia	
	Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample
Sample size	NA	1,860	NA	1,717	NA	2,472	NA	2,488
Man	0.49	0.45	0.51	0.54	0.51	0.58	0.50	0.52
18-24 years old	0.15	0.16	0.10	0.12	0.18	0.23	0.17	0.19
25-34 years old	0.22	0.23	0.20	0.26	0.24	0.27	0.23	0.26
35-49 years old	0.30	0.32	0.28	0.35	0.29	0.24	0.31	0.31
More than 50 years old	0.34	0.29	0.42	0.27	0.28	0.26	0.29	0.24
Income Q1	0.25	0.24	0.25	0.13	0.25	0.27	0.25	0.28
Income Q2	0.25	0.30	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.24	0.25	0.24
Income Q3	0.25	0.24	0.25	0.29	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.23
Income Q4	0.25	0.22	0.25	0.32	0.25	0.24	0.25	0.25
Region 1	0.08	0.07	0.29	0.31	0.27	0.20	0.08	0.07
Region 2	0.09	0.04	0.12	0.17	0.26	0.25	0.30	0.31
Region 3	0.27	0.28	0.08	0.05	0.13	0.15	0.13	0.11
Region 4	0.14	0.15	0.29	0.23	0.20	0.24	0.21	0.20
Region 5	0.42	0.45	0.22	0.24	0.14	0.17	0.27	0.31
Urban	0.69	0.77	0.63	0.53	0.36	0.46	0.57	0.62
College education (25-64)	0.20	0.64	0.10	0.59	0.09	0.72	0.13	0.45
Share of voters	0.67	0.92	NA	NA	0.65	0.79	0.74	0.90
Voters: Left	0.30	0.24	NA	NA	0.39	0.27	0.19	0.42
Voters: Center	0.19	0.10	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.17	0.06
Voters: Right	0.50	0.52	NA	NA	0.46	0.61	0.54	0.39
Voters: Other	0.01	0.06	NA	NA	0.16	0.03	0.10	NA
Voters: Not reported	NA	0.08	NA	NA	NA	0.08	NA	0.13
Inactivity rate (15-64)	0.34	0.12	0.23	0.10	0.46	0.20	0.30	0.20
Unemployment rate (15-64)	0.14	0.11	0.03	0.01	0.09	0.04	0.06	0.05
Employment rate (15-64)	0.57	0.79	0.75	0.89	0.49	0.76	0.66	0.76

Note: This table displays summary statistics of the samples alongside nationally representative statistics. See notes to Table 1. Detailed sources for each variable and country, as well as the definitions of regions, college education, urban, and voting categories are available in Appendix A-7.

Table 5: Sample representativeness – Middle-income countries 2

	Mexico		Turkey		South Africa		Ukraine	
	Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample
Sample size	NA	2,045	NA	1,932	NA	2,003	NA	1,564
Man	0.48	0.49	0.49	0.43	0.49	0.46	0.45	0.61
18-24 years old	0.18	0.18	0.16	0.18	0.21	0.21	0.08	0.12
25-34 years old	0.23	0.24	0.21	0.24	0.28	0.29	0.18	0.25
35-49 years old	0.30	0.31	0.30	0.34	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.40
More than 50 years old	0.29	0.27	0.33	0.24	0.22	0.22	0.46	0.24
Income Q1	0.25	0.26	0.25	0.14	0.25	0.16	0.25	0.17
Income Q2	0.25	0.27	0.25	0.28	0.25	0.24	0.25	0.24
Income Q3	0.25	0.24	0.25	0.28	0.25	0.32	0.25	0.24
Income Q4	0.25	0.22	0.25	0.30	0.25	0.27	0.25	0.36
Region 1	0.33	0.38	0.25	0.28	0.12	0.09	0.31	0.37
Region 2	0.22	0.18	0.18	0.12	0.24	0.29	0.21	0.17
Region 3	0.10	0.10	0.30	0.34	0.18	0.17	0.22	0.26
Region 4	0.13	0.12	0.26	0.26	0.33	0.26	0.25	0.20
Region 5	0.23	0.22	NA	NA	0.13	0.18	NA	NA
Urban	0.64	0.81	0.87	0.96	0.49	0.63	0.70	0.88
College education (25-64)	0.19	0.66	0.16	0.65	0.16	0.49	NA	0.67
Share of voters	0.53	0.86	0.83	0.88	0.44	0.67	0.53	0.76
Voters: Left	0.56	0.54	0.35	0.30	0.68	0.45	0.16	0.19
Voters: Center	0.18	0.10	0.10	0.07	0.21	0.32	0.67	0.69
Voters: Right	0.19	0.20	0.55	0.50	0.06	0.04	0.13	0.03
Voters: Other	0.07	0.02	0.00	NA	0.05	0.04	0.03	NA
Voters: Not reported	NA	0.14	NA	0.14	NA	0.15	NA	0.10
Inactivity rate (15-64)	0.35	0.12	0.45	0.21	0.45	0.16	0.38	0.15
Unemployment rate (15-64)	0.04	0.07	0.13	0.12	0.29	0.16	0.10	0.10
Employment rate (15-64)	0.59	0.81	0.48	0.69	0.38	0.71	0.56	0.76

Note: This table displays summary statistics of the samples alongside nationally representative statistics. See notes to Table 1. Detailed sources for each variable and country, as well as the definitions of regions, college education, urban, and voting categories are available in Appendix A-7.

References

Alsan, Marcella, Luca Braghieri, Sarah Eichmeyer, Minjeong Joyce Kim, Stefanie Stantcheva, and David Y Yang (2021). Civil Liberties in Times of Crisis. NBER Working Paper 27972. *National Bureau of Economic Research*.

Anderson, Soren T., and James M. Sallee (2016). Designing Policies to Make Cars Greener. *Annual Review of Resource Economics*, 8(1): 157–180.

Andre, Peter, Teodora Boneva, Felix Chopra, and Armin Falk (2021). Fighting Climate Change: The Role of Norms, Preferences, and Moral Values. CEPR Discussion Paper No. DP16343. *Center for Economic and Policy Research*.

Baranzini, Andrea, and Stefano Carattini (2017). Effectiveness, Earmarking and Labeling: Testing the Acceptability of Carbon Taxes with Survey Data. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies*, 19(1): 197–227.

Barreca, Alan, Karen Clay, Olivier Deschenes, Michael Greenstone, and Joseph S. Shapiro (2016). Adapting to Climate Change: The Remarkable Decline in the US Temperature-Mortality Relationship over the Twentieth Century. *Journal of Political Economy*, 124(1): 105–159.

Benjamini, Yoav, and Yosef Hochberg (1995). Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 57(1): 289–300.

Bergquist, Parrish, Matto Mildenberger, and Leah C. Stokes (2020). Combining Climate, Economic, and Social Policy Builds Public Support for Climate action in the US. *Environmental Research Letters*, 15(5): 054019.

Bernard, René, Panagiota Tzamourani, and Michael Weber (2022). Climate Change and Individual Behavior. Deutsche Bundesbank Discussion Paper No. 01/2022. *Deutsche Bundesbank*.

Bernauer, Thomas, and Robert Gampfer (2015). How Robust is Public Support for Unilateral Climate Policy? *Environmental Science & Policy*, 54: 316–330.

Bolsen, Toby, Thomas J Leeper, and Matthew A Shapiro (2014). Doing What Others Do: Norms, Science, and Collective Action on Global Warming. *American Politics Research*, 42(1): 65–89.

Boon-Falleur, Mélusine, Aurore Grandin, Nicolas Baumard, and Coralie Chevallier (2022). Leveraging social cognition to promote effective climate change mitigation. *Nature Climate Change*, 1–7. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.

Brannlund, Runar, and Lars Persson (2012). To tax, or not to tax: Preferences for Climate Policy Attributes. *Climate Policy*, 12(6): 704–721.

Carattini, Stefano, Andrea Baranzini, Philippe Thalmann, Frédéric Varone, and Frank Vöhringer (2017). Green Taxes in a Post-Paris World: Are Millions of Nays Inevitable? *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 68(1): 97–128.

Carattini, Stefano, Maria Carvalho, and Sam Fankhauser (2018). Overcoming public resistance to carbon taxes. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 9(5).

Carattini, Stefano, Simon Levin, and Alessandro Tavoni (2019). Cooperation in the Climate Commons. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy*, 13(2): 227–247.

Carleton, Tamma, Amir Jina, Michael Delgado, Michael Greenstone, Trevor Houser, Solomon Hsiang, Andrew Hultgren, Robert E Kopp, Kelly E McCusker, Ishan Nath, James Rising, Ashwin Rode, Hee Kwon Seo, Arvid Viaene, Jiacan Yuan, and Alice Tianbo Zhang (2022). Valuing the Global Mortality Consequences of Climate Change Accounting for Adaptation Costs and Benefits*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, forthcoming.

Chen, C, I Noble, J Hellmann, J Coffee, M Murillo, and N Chawla (2015). University of Notre Dame Global Adaptation Index. University of Notre Dame.

Climate Action Tracker (2021). Warming Projections Global Update.

D'Acunto, Francesco, Sascha Möhrle, Florian Neumeier, Andreas Peichl, and Michael Weber (2022). How to Finance Climate Change Policies? Evidence from Consumers' Beliefs. CESifo Working Paper No. 9727. *Center for Economic Studies*.

Davis, Lucas W. (2008). The Effect of Driving Restrictions on Air Quality in Mexico City. *Journal of Political Economy*, 116(1): 38–81.

Dietz, Simon, and Giles Atkinson (2010). The Equity-Efficiency Trade-off in Environmental Policy: Evidence from Stated Preferences. *Land Economics*, 86: 423–443.

Douenne, Thomas, and Adrien Fabre (2022). Yellow Vests, Pessimistic Beliefs, and Carbon Tax Aversion. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 14(1): 81–110.

Drews, Stefan, and Jeroen C.J.M. van den Bergh (2016). What Explains Public Support for Climate Policies? A Review of Empirical and Experimental Studies. *Climate Policy*, 16(7): 855–876.

EC (2019). Communication from the European Commissions: The European Green Deal. EC.

EC (2020). Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions Europe's moment: Repair and Prepare for the Next Generation. EC.

Eurostat (2020). Climate Change Driving Forces - Statistics Explained.

Ewald, Jens, Thomas Sterner, and Erik Sterner (2022). Understanding the Resistance to Carbon Taxes: Drivers and Barriers among the General Public and Fuel-Tax Protesters. *Resource and Energy Economics*, 70: 101331.

Fehr, Ernst, Thomas Epper, and Julien Senn (2020). Other-Regarding Preferences and Redistributive Politics. *University of Zurich Working Paper*, , (339).

Funk, Patricia (2016). How Accurate Are Surveyed Preferences for Public Policies? Evidence from a Unique Institutional Setup. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 98(3): 442–454.

Gerber, P.J., H. Steinfeld, B. Henderson, A. Mottet, C. Opio, J. Dijkman, A. Falcucci, and G. Tempio (2013). Tackling Climate Change through Livestock – A Global Assessment of Emissions and Mitigation Opportunities. *Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).*

Goldstein, Benjamin, Dimitrios Gounaridis, and Joshua P. Newell (2020). The Carbon Footprint of Household Energy Use in the United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(32): 19122–19130.

Green, Jessica F. (2021). Does Carbon Pricing Reduce Emissions? A Review of ex-post Analyses. *Environmental Research Letters*, 16(4).

Grömping, Ulrike (2007). Estimators of Relative Importance in Linear Regression Based on Variance Decomposition. *The American Statistician*, 61(2): 139–147.

Haaland, Ingar, Christopher Roth, and Johannes Wohlfart (2020). Designing Information Provision Experiments. CESifo Working Paper No. 8406. *Center for Economic Studies.*

Hainmueller, Jens, Dominik Hangartner, and Teppei Yamamoto (2015). Validating vignette and conjoint survey experiments against real-world behavior. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.*

Hepburn, Cameron, Brian O'Callaghan, Nicholas Stern, Joseph Stiglitz, and Zenghelis Dimitri (2020). Will COVID-19 Fiscal Recovery Packages Accelerate or Retard Progress on Climate Change? *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 36(1): S359–S381.

High Level Commission on Carbon Prices (2017). Report of the High Level Commission on Carbon Prices.

IEA (2022). World Energy Outlook. International Energy Agency, Paris.

IPCC (2022). Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

IPCC, AR6 (2021). Summary for Policymakers. In *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*.

Ipsos, EDF (2020). Obs'COP – Climate Change and Public Opinion. 00000.

Jagers, Sverker C., and Henrik Hammar (2009). Environmental Taxation for Good and for Bad: The Efficiency and Legitimacy of Sweden's Carbon Tax. *Environmental Politics*, 18(2): 218–237.

Johnston, Robert J., Kevin J. Boyle, Wiktor (Vic) Adamowicz, Jeff Bennett, Roy Brouwer, Trudy Ann Cameron, W. Michael Hanemann, Nick Hanley, Mandy Ryan, Riccardo Scarpa, Roger Tourangeau, and Christian A. Vossler (2017). Contemporary Guidance for Stated Preference Studies. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists*, 4(2): 319–405.

JRC, European Commission (2018). Fossil CO2 Emissions of all World Countries: 2018 report.

Kahan, Dan M. (2015). Climate-Science Communication and the Measurement Problem. *Political Psychology*, 36(S1): 1–43. 00369.

Klenert, David, Linus Mattauch, Emmanuel Combet, Ottmar Edenhofer, Cameron Hepburn, Ryan Rafaty, and Nicholas Stern (2018). Making Carbon Pricing Work for Citizens. *Nature Climate Change*, 8(8): 669–677.

Labandeira, Xavier, José M. Labeaga, and Xiral López-Otero (2017). A Meta-Analysis on the Price Elasticity of Energy Demand. *Energy Policy*, 102: 549–568. 00243.

Leiserowitz, Anthony, Jennifer Carman, Nicole Buttermore, Xinran Wang, Seth Rosenthal, Jennifer Marlon, and Kelsey Mulcahy (2021). International Public Opinion on Climate Change. Yale Program on Climate Change Communication and Facebook Data for Good.

Lindeman, Richard Harold, Peter Francis Merenda, and Ruth Z Gold (1980). *Introduction to bivariate and multivariate analysis.* Glenview, Ill.:Scott, Foresman. OCLC: 5310754.

Maestre-Andrés, Sara, Stefan Drews, and Jeroen van den Bergh (2019). Perceived Fairness and Public Acceptability of Carbon Pricing: A Review of the Literature. *Climate Policy*, 19(9): 1186–1204.

Marron, Donald B., and Elaine Maag (2018). How to Design Carbon Dividends. *Tax Policy Center: Urban Institute and Brookings Institution.*

McEvoy, David M., and Todd L. Cherry (2016). The Prospects for Paris: Behavioral Insights into Unconditional Cooperation on Climate Change. *Palgrave Communications*, 2(1): 1–6.

McGrath, Liam F., and Thomas Bernauer (2017). How Strong is Public Support for Unilateral Climate Policy and What Drives It? *WIREs Climate Change*, 8(6): e484.

Mildenberger, Matto, and Dustin Tingley (2019). Beliefs about Climate Beliefs: The Importance of Second-Order Opinions for Climate Politics. *British Journal of Political Science*, 49(4): 1279–1307.

Mildenberger, Matto, Erick Lachapelle, Kathryn Harrison, and Isabelle Stadelmann-Steffen (2022). Limited impacts of carbon tax rebate programmes on public support for carbon pricing. *Nature Climate Change*, 1–7. Bandiera_abtest: a Cg_type: Nature Research Journals Primary_atype: Research Publisher: Nature Publishing Group Subject_term: Climate-change mitigation;Government;Politics Subject_term_id: climate-change-mitigation;government;politics.

NPUC (2021). Race to Net Zero: Carbon Neutral Goals by Country.

Sommer, Stephan, Linus Mattauch, and Michael Pahle (2022). Supporting Carbon Taxes: The Role of Fairness. *Ecological Economics*, 195: 107359.

Stantcheva, Stefanie (2021). Understanding Tax Policy: How Do People Reason? *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 136(4): 2309–2369.

Stantcheva, Stefanie (2022). How to Run Surveys: A guide to creating your own identifying variation and revealing the invisible. NBER Working Paper No. 30527. *National Bureau of Economic Research*.

Stiglitz, Joseph E, Nicholas Stern, Maosheng Duan, Ottmar Edenhofer, Gaël Giraud, Geoffrey M Heal, Emilio Lèbre La Rovere, Adele Morris, Elisabeth Moyer, Mari Pangestu, and others (2017). Report of the High-Level Commission on Carbon Prices.

Stokes, Bruce, Richard Wike, and Jill Carle (2015). Global Concern about Climate Change, Broad Support for Limiting Emissions. *Pew Research Center's Global Attitudes Project*.

Sunstein, Cass R, Sebastian Bobadilla-Suarez, Stephanie C Lazzaro, and Tali Sharot (2017). How People Update Beliefs about Climate Change: Good News and Bad News. *CORNELL LAW REVIEW*, 102: 14. 00000.

Sælen, Håkon, and Steffen Kallbekken (2011). A Choice Experiment on Fuel Taxation and Earmarking in Norway. *Ecological Economics*, 70(11): 2181–2190.

Tannenbaum, David, Alain Cohn, Christian Lukas Zund, and Michel André Maréchal (2020). What Do Cross-Country Surveys Tell us About Social Capital? *CESifo Working Paper*, , (8418).

Tarduno, Matthew (2020). What Drives Support for Inefficient Environmental Policies? Evidence from a Nevada Ballot Initiative. *Berkeley Law, Economics, and Politics Center Working Paper*.

Thalmann, Philippe (2004). The Public Acceptance of Green Taxes: 2 Million Voters Express Their Opinion. *Public Choice*, 119(1/2): 179–217.

Umit, Resul, and Lena Maria Schaffer (2020). Attitudes towards Carbon Taxes across Europe: The Role of Perceived Uncertainty and Self-Interest. *Energy Policy*, 140: 111385.

UNDP, Oxford University (2021). The Peoples' Climate Vote.

US Congress (2021). Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.

Whitmarsh, Lorraine, and Stuart Capstick (2018). Perceptions of Climate Change. In *Psychology and Climate Change*. , ed. Susan Clayton and Christie Manning, 13–33. Academic Press.

Wolff, Hendrik (2014). Keep Your Clunker in the Suburb: Low-Emission Zones and Adoption of Green Vehicles. *The Economic Journal*, 124(578): F481–F512.

Online Appendix for "Fighting Climate Change: International Attitudes Toward Climate Policies"

List of Figures

List of Tables

A-1 Variable Definition

Indices

The summary indices that aggregate information over the same domain are constructed following the methodology in Kling, Liebman and Katz (2007). Each index consists of an equally weighted average of the z-scores of its components with signs oriented consistently within domain (e.g., the higher the *Knowledge index*, the higher the belief of the climate knowledge of the respondent). Variables are transformed into z-scores by subtracting the control group mean and dividing by the control group standard deviation, so that each z-score has mean 0 and standard deviation 1 for the control group. To further ease interpretation, the resulting index is itself standardized by subtracting the mean and dividing by the standard deviation, so that each index has mean zero and standard deviation one.

Set A: Socioeconomic characteristics (indicator variables)
Woman: respondent is a woman.
Other: respondent's gender is neither a woman nor a man.
Lives with child(ren) under 14: respondent lives with at least one child below 14 (or has at least one child, for the U.S.) .
Age 18-24: respondent's age is between 18 and 24 years (usually omitted category in the regressions).
Age 25-34: respondent's age is between 25 and 34 years.
Age 35-49: respondent's age is between 35 and 49 years.
Age 50+: respondent's age is more than 50 years old.
Income Q1: respondent's household income (before withholding tax) is in the first quartile of her country distribution (usually omitted category in the regressions).
Income Q2: respondent's household income (before withholding tax) is between the first and second quartiles of her country distribution.
Income Q3: respondent's household income (before withholding tax) is between the second and third quartiles of her country distribution.
Income Q4: respondent's household income (before withholding tax) is above the third quartile of her country distribution.
Has little to no schooling: respondent received no schooling or highest level achieved is primary or lower secondary education (usually the omitted category for the regressions).
Has vocational or high-school degree: respondent's highest degree is either a vocational or a high-school degree and has at least achieved primary or lower secondary education.
Has a college degree: respondent has at least a college degree.
Very Left leaning respondent's economic policy leaning is very left.
Left leaning: respondent's economic policy leaning is either left (usually omitted category in the regressions).
Center leaning: respondent's economic policy leaning is center.
Right leaning: respondent's economic policy leaning is right.

Very Right leaning: respondent's economic policy leaning is very right.
Treatment: None: respondent was randomized to see no information treatment, i.e., the control group (usually omitted category in the regressions).
Treatment: Climate impacts: respondent was randomized to see the information treatment focused on the effects of climate change.
Treatment: Climate policies: respondent was randomized to see the information treatment focused on the climate policies.
Treatment: Both: respondent was randomized to see the information treatment focused on both climate policies and the effects of climate change.

Set B: Energy usage and lifestyle characteristics (indicator variables)
Rural area: respondent lives in a rural area, i.e., a town of less than 5,000 inhabitants (for China in a town of less than 10,000 inhabitants, for Denmark in a town of less than 1,000 inhabitants).
Small agglomeration: respondent indicates living in a town between 5,000 and 10,000 inhabitants (for China in a town between 10,000 and 100,000 inhabitants, for Denmark in a town between 1,000 and 20,000 inhabitants).
Medium agglomeration: respondent indicates living in an agglomeration between 50,000 and 250,000 inhabitants (for China in an agglomeration between 100,000 and 1,000,000 inhabitants, for Denmark in an agglomeration between 20,000 and 100,000 inhabitants) .
Large agglomeration: respondent lives in an agglomeration of more than 500,000 inhabitants (for China more than 1,000,000 inhabitants, for Denmark in an agglomeration of more than 100,000 inhabitants).
Public transport available: respondent indicates that the availability of public transport are "very poor" or "poor" where she lives.
Uses car: respondent indicates she uses a car or a motorbike for at least one activity (work, leisure, or shopping).
High gas expenses: respondent's monthly gas expenses are above the median expenses of the respondent's income quartile in her country.
High heating expenses: respondent's yearly heating or cooling expenses are above the median expenses of the respondent's income quartile in her country.
Flies more than once a year: respondent takes on average more than one round-trip flight per year.
Polluting Sector: respondent's economic works in a polluting sector.
Eats beef/meat weekly or more: respondent indicates eating beef (meat in India) weekly or daily.
Owner or landlord: respondent is a homeowner or a landlord renting out property.

Set C: Reasoning and perceptions of climate change and policies (index variables)
Trusts the government: index based on the following variable:

- *Trust govt:* respondent's answer to the question: "*Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: 'Over the last decade the [Country] government could generally be*

trusted to do what is right.,'" coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Strongly disagree*," 0 is "*Neither agree nor disagree*," and 2 is "*Strongly agree*."

Believes inequality is an important problem: index based on the following variable:

- *Ineq. problem:* respondent's answer to the question: "*How big of an issue do you think income inequality is in [Country]?"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Not an issue at all*," 0 is "*An issue*," and 2 is "*A very serious issue*."

Worries about the consequences of CC: index based on the following variables:

- Respondent's answers to the questions "*If nothing is done to limit climate change, how likely do you think it is that climate change will lead to* [consequences]" coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Very unlikely*," there is no 0, and 2 is "*Very likely*." Where [consequence] is *larger immigration flows*, *more armed conflicts*, *the extinction of humankind*, or *drop in standards of livings*

- *Climate change problem:* respondent's answer to the question: "*Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: 'Climate change is an important problem.'"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Strongly disagree*," 0 is "*Neither agree nor disagree*," and 2 is "*Strongly agree*."

- *Climate change end:* respondent's answer to the question: "*How likely is it that human kind halts climate change by the end of the century?"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Very unlikely*," there is no 0, and 2 is "*Very likely*."

- *Environmentalist:* respondent is a member of an environmental organization.

Believe will suffer from climate change: index based on the following variable:

- *Suffers from CC:* respondent's answer to the question: "*To what extent do you think climate change already affects or will affect your personal life negatively?"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Not at all*," 0 is "*Moderately*," and 2 is "*A great deal*."

Understands emissions across activities/regions: index based on the following variables:

- *Score footprint transport:* respondent's Kendall distance with true ranking on knowledge questions about transport emissions.

- *Score footprint electricity:* respondent's Kendall distance with true ranking on knowledge questions about electricity production emissions.

- *Score footprint food:* respondent's Kendall distance with true ranking on knowledge questions about food emissions.

- *Score footprint countries per capita:* respondent's Kendall distance with true ranking on knowledge questions about countries' emissions per capita.

- *Score footprint countries per region:* respondent's Kendall distance with true ranking on knowledge questions about total regions' emissions.

Knows climate change real: index based on the following variables:

- *Climate change real:* respondent indicates that climate change is real.
- *Cutting emissions by half insufficient to stop global warming:* indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent thinks that cutting global greenhouse gas emissions by half would not be sufficient to eventually stop temperatures from rising.
- *Climate change exists, is anthropogenic:* respondent indicates that "*A lot*" or "*Most*" of climate change is due to human activity.

Knows which gases cause CC: index based on the following variables:

- *Methane is a greenhouse gas:* respondent indicates that methane is a GHG.
- *CO_2 is a greenhouse gas:* respondent indicates that CO_2 is a GHG.
- *H_2 is not a greenhouse gas:* respondent indicates that H_2 is not a GHG.
- *Particulates are not a greenhouse gas:* respondent indicates that particulates are not a GHG.

Understands impacts of CC: index based on the following variables:

- *Severe droughts and heatwaves are likely:* respondent indicates that it is "*Somewhat likely*" or "*Very likely*" that climate change will lead to severe droughts and heatwaves.
- *Sea-level rise is likely:* respondent indicates that it is "*Somewhat likely*" or "*Very likely*" that climate change will lead to rising sea levels.
- *More frequent volcanic eruptions are unlikely:* respondent indicates that it is "*Somewhat unlikely*" or "*Very unlikely*" that climate change will lead to more frequent volcanic eruptions.

For each [policy] = *a ban on combustion-engine cars; a green infrastructure program;* or *a carbon tax with cash transfers*, we define the following indices:

Believes [policy] would have positive econ. effect: index based on the following variable:

- respondent's answer to the question: "*Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? [Policy] would have a positive effect on the [Country] economy and employment*" coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Strongly disagree*," 0 is "*Neither agree nor disagree*," and 2 is "*Strongly agree*." When defined as an indicator variable, equals 1 if the respondent "*somewhat agrees*" or "*strongly agrees*."

Believes [policy] would reduce pollution: index based on the following variable:

- respondent's answer to the question: "*Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? [Policy] would reduce air pollution"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Strongly disagree*," 0 is "*Neither agree nor disagree*," and 2 is "*Strongly agree*." When defined as an indicator variable, equals 1 if the respondent "*somewhat agrees*" or "*strongly agrees*."

Believes the policy would reduce emissions – Ban on combustion-engine cars: index based on the following variable:

- respondent's answer to the question: "*Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? A ban on combustion-engine cars would reduce CO_2 emissions from cars"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Strongly disagree*," 0 is "*Neither agree nor disagree*," and 2 is "*Strongly agree*." When defined as an indicator variable, equals 1 if the respondent "*somewhat agrees*" or "*strongly agrees*."

Believes the policy would reduce emissions – Green infrastructure program: index based on the following variables:

- respondent's answer to the question: "*Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? A green infrastructure program would make electricity production greener"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Strongly disagree*," 0 is "*Neither agree nor disagree*," and 2 is "*Strongly agree*." When defined as an indicator variable, equals 1 if the respondent "*somewhat agrees*" or "*strongly agrees*."

- respondent's answer to the question: "*Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? A green infrastructure program would increase the use of public transport"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Strongly disagree*," 0 is "*Neither agree nor disagree*," and 2 is "*Strongly agree*." When defined as an indicator variable, equals 1 if the respondent "*somewhat agrees*" or "*strongly agrees*."

Believes the policy would reduce emissions – Carbon tax with cash transfers: index based on the following variables:

- respondent's answer to the question: "*Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? A carbon tax with cash transfers would reduce the use of fossil fuels and GHG emissions"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Strongly disagree*," 0 is "*Neither agree nor disagree*," and 2 is "*Strongly agree*." When defined as an indicator variable, equals 1 if the respondent "*somewhat agrees*" or "*strongly agrees*."

- respondent's answer to the question: "*Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? A carbon tax with cash transfers would encourage people to drive less"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Strongly disagree*," 0 is "*Neither agree nor disagree*," and 2 is "*Strongly agree*." When defined as an indicator variable, equals 1 if the respondent "*somewhat agrees*" or "*strongly agrees*."

- respondent's answer to the question: "*Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? A carbon tax with cash transfers would reduce encoure people and companies to insulate buildings"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Strongly disagree*," 0 is "*Neither agree nor disagree*," and 2 is "*Strongly agree*." When defined as an indicator variable, equals 1 if the respondent "*somewhat agrees*" or "*strongly agrees*."

Believes own household would lose from [policy]: index based on the following variable:

- respondent's answer to the question: "*Do you think that your household would win or lose financially from [policy]?"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Lose a lot*," 0 is "*Neither win nor lose*," and 2 is "*Win a lot*." When defined as an indicator variable, equals 1 if the respondent answers "*mostly win*" or " *win a lot*."

Believes low-income earners will lose from [policy]: index based on the following variable:

- respondent's answer to the question: "*In your view, would the low-income earners win or lose if [policy] was implemented in [Country]?"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Lose a lot*," 0 is "*Neither win nor lose*," and 2 is "*Win a lot*." When defined as an indicator variable, equals 1 if the respondent answers "*mostly win*" or " *win a lot*."

Believes high-income earners will lose from [policy]: index based on the following variables:

- respondent's answer to the question: "*In your view, would the high-income earners win or lose if a ban on combustion-engine cars was implemented in [Country]?"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Lose a lot*," 0 is "*Neither win nor lose*," and 2 is "*Win a lot*." When defined as an indicator variable, equals 1 if the respondent answers "*mostly win*" or " *win a lot*."

Set Cbis: Reasoning and perceptions of climate change and policies (indices based on the variables of other indices)

We use the underlying variables of some indices of Set C to construct the indices of Set Cbis (using the same methodology to construct indices).

Believes policies would have positive econ. effects: index based on the following variables:

- *Econ. effects halting CC:* respondent's answer to the question: "*If we decide to halt climate change through ambitious policies, what would be the effects on the [Country] economy and employment?"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Very negative effects*," 0 is "*No noticeable effects*," and 2 is "*Very positive effects*."

- The underlying variables of the three *Believes [policy] would have positive econ. effect* indices.

Believes policies would reduce pollution: index based on the following variable:

- The underlying variables of the three *Believes [policy] would reduce pollution:* indices.

Believes policies would reduce emissions: index based on the underlying variables of the following indices:

- *Believes the policy would reduce emissions – Ban on combustion-engine cars:* index based on the following variable
- *Believes the policy would reduce emissions – Green infrastructure program:* index based on the following variable
- *Believes the policy would reduce emissions – Carbon tax with cash transfers:* index based on the following variable

Believes will personally lose: index based on the following variable:

- The underlying variables of the three *Believes own household would lose from [policy]* indices.

Believes poor people will lose: index based on the following variable:

- The underlying variables of the three *Believes low-income earners will lose from [policy]* indices.

Believes rich people will lose: index based on the following variable:

- The underlying variables of the three *Believes high-income earners will lose from [policy]* indices.

Set D: Outcomes

Distributional Impacts – The middle class (Green infrastructure/Carbon tax w. transfers/Ban on combustion-engine cars): indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent considers that the middle class would "*mostly win*" or " *win a lot*" from a green infrastructure program/a carbon tax with cash transfers/a ban on combustion-engine cars.

Distributional Impacts – Those living in rural areas (Green infrastructure/Carbon tax w. transfers/Ban on combustion-engine cars): indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent considers that those living in rural areas would "*mostly win*" or " *win a lot*" from a green infrastructure program/a carbon tax with cash transfers/a ban on combustion-engine cars.

Effects – Costless way to fight climate change (Green infrastructure/Carbon tax w. transfers/Ban on combustion-engine cars): indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat agrees*" or " *strongly agrees*" that a green infrastructure program/a carbon tax with cash transfers/a ban on combustion-engine cars would be a costless way to fight climate change.

Factors – Ambitious climate policies: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent indicates that it is "*a lot*" or "*a great deal*" important for them to adopt a sustainable life (i.e. limit driving, flying, and consumption, bike more, etc.) to have ambitious climate policies.

Factors – Having enough financial support: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent indicates that it is "*a lot*" or "*a great deal*" important for them to adopt a sustainable life

(i.e. limit driving, flying, and consumption, bike more, etc.) that they have enough financial support.
Factors – People around you also changing their behavior: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent indicates that it is "*a lot*" or "*a great deal*" important for them to adopt a sustainable life (i.e. limit driving, flying, and consumption, bike more, etc.) that the people around them also change their behavior.
Factors – The most well off also changing their behavior: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent indicates that it is "*a lot*" or "*a great deal*" important for them to adopt a sustainable life (i.e. limit driving, flying, and consumption, bike more, etc.) that the most well-off also change their behavior.
Fairness of main climate policies: index based on the following variables. When defined as an indicator variable, equals 1 if the numerical mean of those variables is greater than or equal to 1.

- *[Policy] fairness:* respondent's answer to the question: "*Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: '[Policy] is fair.'*" Coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Strongly disagree*," 0 is "*Neither agree nor disagree*," and 2 is "*Strongly agree*." Where [Policy] is *a ban on combustion-engine cars*, *a green infrastructure program*, or *a carbon tax with cash transfers*.'

GHG footprint of beef/meat is higher than chicken or pasta: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent considers that a beef steak (or lamb chop in India) of 200g emits more greenhouse gases than 200g of a serving of pasta or chicken wings.
GHG footprint of nuclear is lower than gas or coal: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent considers that a nuclear power plant emits less greenhouse gases to provide electricity for a house than a gas-fired power plant or a coal-fired power station.
GHG footprint of plane is higher than car or train/bus: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent considers that for a trip of 700 km family of four emits more greenhouse gases travelling by plane than by travelling by car or a train/bus.
Knowledge index: index based on the variables used for the *Understands emissions across activities/regions*, *Knows climate change real*, *Knows which gases cause CC*, and *Understands impacts of CC* indices listed above.
Indifferent – All main climate policies: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*neither supports nor opposes*" a ban on combustion-engine cars, a carbon tax with cash transfers, and a green infrastructure program.
Indifferent – Ban on combustion-engine cars: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*neither supports nor opposse*" a ban on combustion-engine cars.
Support – Carbon tax with cash transfers: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*neither supports nor opposes*" a carbon tax with cash transfers.
Indifferent – Green infrastructure program: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*neither supports nor opposes*" a green infrastructure program.
Per capita emissions of the U.S. are higher than other regions: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent considers that the consumption of an average person in the U.S. contributes more to global greenhouse gas emissions than the consumption of an average person in the

European Union, China, or India.
Perceived Fairness and Support – Support (Green infrastructure/Carbon tax w. transfers/Ban on combustion-engine cars): indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or " *strongly supports*" a green infrastructure program/a carbon tax with cash transfers/a ban on combustion-engine cars.
Perceived Fairness and Support – Is fair (Green infrastructure/Carbon tax w. transfers/Ban on combustion-engine cars): indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat agrees*" or " *strongly agrees*" that a green infrastructure program/a carbon tax with cash transfers/a ban on combustion-engine cars is fair.
Support – A high tax on cattle products, doubling beef prices: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" a high tax on cattle products, so that the price of beef doubles.
Support – Ban of intensive cattle farming: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" the ban of intensive cattle farming.
Support – Ban of polluting vehicles in dense areas: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" a ban of polluting vehicles in dense areas, like city centers.
Support – Ban on combustion-engine cars: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" a ban on combustion-engine cars.
Support – Ban on combustion-engine cars w. alternatives available: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" a ban on combustion-engine cars where alternatives such as public transports are made available to people.
Support – Carbon tax with cash transfers: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" a carbon tax with cash transfers.
Support – Cash transfers to the constrained households: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" a carbon tax that would raise gasoline prices by 8 cents per liter, if the government used this revenue to finance cash transfers to households with no alternative to using fossil fuels.
Support – Cash transfers to the poorest households: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" a carbon tax that would raise gasoline prices by 8 cents per liter, if the government used this revenue to finance cash transfers to the poorest households.
Support – Equal cash transfers to all households: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" a carbon tax that would raise gasoline prices by 8 cents per liter, if the government used this revenue to finance equal cash transfers to all households.
Support – Funding environmental infrastructures: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" a carbon tax that would raise gasoline prices by 8 cents per liter, if the government used this revenue to fund environmental infrastructure projects (public transport, cycling ways, etc.).
Support – Green infrastructure program: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" a green infrastructure program.

Support – Mandatory and subsidized insulation of buildings: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" a policy where the governments makes it mandatory for all residential buildings to have insulation that meets a certain energy efficiency standard before 2040 and where it would subsidize half of the insulation costs.
Support – Reduction in corporate income taxes: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" a carbon tax that would raise gasoline prices by 8 cents per liter, if the government used this revenue to finance a reduction in corporate income taxes.
Support – Reduction in personal income taxes: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" a carbon tax that would raise gasoline prices by 8 cents per liter, if the government used this revenue to finance a reduction in personal income taxes.
Support – Reduction in the public deficit: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" a carbon tax that would raise gasoline prices by 8 cents per liter, if the government used this revenue to finance a reduction in the public deficit.
Support – Removal of subsidies for cattle farming: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" the removal of subsidies for cattle farming.
Support – Subsidies for low-carbon technologies: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" subsidies for low-carbon technologies (renewable energy, capture and storage of carbon. . .).
Support – Subsidies on organic and local vegetables: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" subsidies on organic and local vegetables, fruits, and nuts.
Support – Subsidies to low-carbon tech.: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" a carbon tax that would raise gasoline prices by 8 cents per liter, if the government used this revenue to subsidize low-carbon technologies, including renewable energy.
Support – Tax on flying (+20%): indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" a tax on flying (that increases ticket prices by 20%).
Support – Tax on fossil fuels ($45/tCO$_2$): indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" a national tax on fossil fuels (increasing gasoline prices by the equivalent of 8 cents per liter).
Support – Tax rebates for the most affected firms: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent "*somewhat supports*" or "*strongly supports*" a carbon tax that would raise gasoline prices by 8 cents per liter, if the government used this revenue to finance tax rebates for the most affected firms.
Support main climate policies index: index based on the following variables:

- *Ban on combustion-engine cars support:* respondent's answer to the question: "*Do you support or oppose a ban on combustion-engine cars?"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Strongly oppose*," 0 is "*Neither support nor oppose*," and 2 is "*Strongly support*."
- *Carbon tax with cash transfers support:* respondent's answer to the question: "*Do you*

support or oppose a carbon tax with cash transfers?" coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Strongly oppose*," 0 is "*Neither support nor oppose*," and 2 is "*Strongly support*."

- *Green infrastructure program support:* respondent's answer to the question: "*Do you support or oppose a green infrastructure program?"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Strongly oppose*," 0 is "*Neither support nor oppose*," and 2 is "*Strongly support*."

Total emissions of China are higher than other regions: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent considers that the total emissions of China are higher than those of the U.S., the European Union, or India.
Willingness to adopt climate-friendly behavior: index based on the following variables. When defined as an indicator variable, equals 1 if the numerical mean of those variables is greater than or equal to 1 and where missing values are replaced with 0 when all the variables are not missing.

- *Limit flying:* respondent's answer to the question: "*Here are possible behaviors that experts say would help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. To what extent would you be willing to limit flying"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Not at all*," 0 is "*Moderately*," and 2 is "*A great deal*." When defined as an indicator variable, equals 1 if the respondent answers "*a lot*" or "*a great deal*."

- *Limit driving:* respondent's answer to the question: "*Here are possible behaviors that experts say would help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. To what extent would you be willing to limit driving"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Not at all*," 0 is "*Moderately*," and 2 is "*A great deal*." When defined as an indicator variable, equals 1 if the respondent answers "*a lot*" or "*a great deal*."

- *Have a fuel-efficient or electric vehicle:* respondent's answer to the question: "*Here are possible behaviors that experts say would help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. To what extent would you be willing to have an electric vehicle"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Not at all*," 0 is "*Moderately*," and 2 is "*A great deal*." When defined as an indicator variable, equals 1 if the respondent answers "*a lot*" or "*a great deal*."

- *Limit beef/meat consumption:* respondent's answer to the question: "*Here are possible behaviors that experts say would help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. To what extent would you be willing to limit beef consumption"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Not at all*," 0 is "*Moderately*," and 2 is "*A great deal*." When defined as an indicator variable, equals 1 if the respondent answers "*a lot*" or "*a great deal*."

- *Limit heating or cooling your home:* respondent's answer to the question: "*Here are possible behaviors that experts say would help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. To what extent would you be willing to limit heating or cooling your home"* coded on a -2 to 2 scale, where -2 is "*Not at all*," 0 is "*Moderately*," and 2 is "*A great deal*." When defined as an indicator variable, equals 1 if the respondent answers "*a lot*" or "*a great deal*."

Willing to sign petition: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent supports the petition.
Willing to donate to reforestation cause: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent is willing to give a share of the lottery prize.
% of prize willing to donate to reforestation cause: continuous variable from 0 to 1 equal to the share of the lottery prize the respondent is willing to donate
Willing to pay to fight global warming: indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent is willing to contribute annually a given amount to limit global warming to safe levels. This amount displayed to each respondent is randomly drawn from the following options (with conversion in local currency): $10 / $30 / $50 / $100 / $300 / $500 / $1,000.

A-2 Data collection and survey information

A-2.1 Data collection

Socioeconomic composition The respondents who choose to respond are first channeled through screening questions that ensure that the final sample is representative along the dimensions of gender, age, income (by quartile), region, and urban versus rural place of residence.[28]

Duration We launched the survey in 2021 at different dates for each country, starting with the U.S. in March, Denmark and France in May, Germany in August, and the other countries in the Fall. Although the duration of data collection varied from country to country, on average we collected 81% of our data less than one month after the launch.

Median duration of responses is 28 minutes (excluding responses below 11 minutes), with some heterogeneity within and between countries. Figure A1 shows the distribution of durations on the whole sample as well as on some specific countries, including those with the lowest and the highest median durations (India and South Africa).

A-2.2 Data quality

Ex post, we checked that there were few careless response patterns. There are several matrices in the questionnaires, where respondents have to choose a response among a 4- or 5-point scale for each item. Respondents who rush carelessly through the survey tend to choose the same answer for all items in a given matrix. Thus, the number of matrices answered with the same response to all items is a good indicator of the quality of a response.

[28] An additional quota variable was used in two countries: ethnicity in the U.S. and education in France. Whenever possible, we recover region and rural/urban category from the zipcode. The income variable used is the standard of living (or equivalised disposable income as defined per Eurostat). We ask for the household income and adjust the categories displayed to the respondent to the number of consumption units in their household (e.g., we multiply the income thresholds by 1.5 for a childless couple). See Appendix A-7 for details on the data sources.

Figure A1: Distribution of duration of responses



Note: The vertical line represents the rushed-response threshold, of 11.5 min, below which responses are taken out of the final sample.

On average over all respondents, 20% of the matrices are concerned (with a maximum of 27% in Turkey). Because in some cases, respondents may genuinely give the same answer to all items of a matrix, we may focus on respondents who give the same answer to at least half of the 14 matrices of the survey: there are 11% such respondents overall, with a maximum of 19% in Indonesia. Respondents with more matrices with the same answer are significantly more indifferent to policy support; they are also less likely to support and less likely to oppose policies. For example, indifference to the support of a carbon tax with cash transfers is 24 p.p. more likely as the share of same-answer matrices goes from 0 to 1. Given the relatively low number of respondents concerned by this careless response patterns, the impact on our results is likely small, and tends to overestimate the indifference to policies, if anything. Other evidence confirms a share of careless answers below one fifth. 15% of respondents do not answer to the open field (with a maximum of 30% in Mexico). Two questions in the survey ask for the support for a carbon tax with equal cash transfers: a standalone question in the corresponding block, and a matrix item in the question that compares different revenue-use of a carbon tax: 14% of respondents express their support at one occurrence and their opposition at the other, with a maximum of 17% in Mexico. Finally, all respondents rank from first to fourth the four regions proposed in terms of total emissions, although they could have ranked no country first as they were able to express ties.

Figure A2: Correlation between perceptions and reality



Note: The figure shows the regression results of indices on the University of Notre Dame vulnerability to climate change index (Chen et al. 2015). The two indices used are the *Worries about the consequences of CC* and the *Believes will suffer from climate change* indices. See Appendix A-1 for more precise definitions of the variables.

A-3 Additional figures

Figure A3: Expectations about the future

(A) Shares of respondents who agree (somewhat to strongly) with each statement by country



(B) Correlation between expectations about the future and socioeconomic characteristics



Note: For Panel A, answers to questions about CC impacts are *"Very unlikely"*, *"Unlikely"*, *"Likely"*, or *"Very likely"*, for the other questions respondents are asked if they *"Strongly disagree"*, *"Somewhat disagree"*, *"Neither agree nor disagree"*, *"Somewhat agree"*, or *"Strongly agree"* with the statement. Depicted are the shares that find the statement *"Likely"* or *"Very likely"*, or *"Somewhat agree"* or *"Strongly agree"* with it. The shares represented are based on respondents in the control group only (who did not see any pedagogical videos). Panel B shows the coefficients from a regression of holding negative views about the future (as indicator variables) on indicator variables for socioeconomic characteristics, as well as country fixed effects and treatment indicators (not shown). For a list of all omitted categories, see the notes to Figure 6. See Appendix A-1 for more precise definitions of the variables.

Figure A4: Share of non-indifferent respondents who support policies (somewhat or strongly)



Note: Policy views are elicited on a 5-point scale "Strongly oppose," "Somewhat oppose," "Neither support nor oppose," "Somewhat support," "Strongly support." The figure shows the share of respondents to answer "Somewhat support," or "Strongly support" among those who did not answer "Neither support nor oppose" (see Figure 8 for support among all respondents). The shares represented are based on respondents in the control group only (who did not see any pedagogical videos). For the exact phrasing of each question, see Appendix A-5.

Figure A5: Support for variants of the ban on combustion-engine cars



Note: After the support for a ban, respondents are randomly allocated to three groups: the first two are asked whether they support a variant where the ban is replaced by a €10,000 or €100,000 penalty, and the third is asked to rank the three variants of the ban. Policy support is elicited on a 5-point scale "Strongly oppose," "Somewhat oppose," "Neither support nor oppose," "Somewhat support," and "Strongly support." The figure shows the share of respondents to answer "Somewhat support," or "Strongly support". The shares represented are based on respondents in the control group only (who did not see any pedagogical videos). For the exact phrasing of each question, see Appendix A-5.

Figure A6: Share of respondents who find the following sources of funding appropriate for public investments in green infrastructure? (Multiple answers possible)



Note: Share of respondents who find the listed sources of funding appropriate. The carbon tax did not appear in the possible options; the figures for the carbon tax are taken from another question, and correspond to people who *"Support"* or *"Strongly support"* a carbon tax that would raise gasoline prices by 40 cents (or equivalent) per gallon, if the government used its revenue for funding environmental infrastructure projects. The shares represented are based on respondents in the control group only (who did not see any pedagogical videos).

Figure A7: Support for main climate policies

(A) Correlation between support for the main climate policies and socioeconomic and energy usage characteristics



(B) Heterogeneous effects of car-dependency across countries



Note: Panel A shows the coefficients from regressions of support for climate policies (indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent supports the policy somewhat or strongly) on socioeconomic indicators (left panel) and on socioeconomic and energy usage indicators (right panel). Country fixed effects and treatment indicators are included but not displayed, likewise for individual socioeconomic characteristics in the right panel. For a list of all omitted categories, see the notes to Figure 9. Panel B reports the coefficients on car-dependency across countries, using the same controls as in panel A. See Appendix A-1 for variable detailed definitions. Control group means are .52 for *Ban on combustion-engine cars*, .66 for *Green infrastructure program*, and .46 for *Carbon tax with cash transfers*.

Figure A8: Share who support the main climate policies by socioeconomic, energy usage characteristics, and treatment group in high-income countries



Note: The figure shows the share of respondents who support (somewhat or strongly) each of the three main policies, by group. Except for the rows labeled "Treatment," all means are taken over respondents in the control group only (who did not see any pedagogical videos). A 95% confidence interval is displayed. See Appendix A-1 for detailed variable definitions.

Figure A9: Share who support the main climate policies by socioeconomic, energy usage characteristics, and treatment group in middle-income countries



Note: The figure shows the share of respondents who support (somewhat or strongly) each of the three main policies, by group. Except for the rows labeled "Treatment" all means are taken over respondents in the control group only (who did not see any pedagogical videos). A 95% confidence interval is displayed. See Appendix A-1 for variable detailed definitions.

Figure A10: Correlation between indifference towards the main climate policies and socioeconomic and energy usage characteristics



Note: The figure shows the coefficients from a regression of being indifferent to the three main climate policies (indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent neither support nor oppose the policy). In the right panel, we control for but do not display the coefficients on socioeconomic indicators. Country fixed effects and indicators for each treatment are included but not displayed. The omitted category for *Place characteristics* is "Rural or very small agglomeration." For a list of all omitted categories, see the notes to Figure 6. See Appendix A-1 for detailed variable definitions.

Figure A11: Correlation between support for the other climate policies and socioeconomic and energy usage characteristics



Note: The figure shows the results of regressions of support for climate policies (indicators) on socioeconomic indicators (left panel) and on socioeconomic and energy usage indicators (right panel). Country fixed effects and treatment indicators are included but not displayed, likewise for individual socioeconomic characteristics in the right panel. See Appendix A-1 for variable detailed definitions. Control group means are .57 for *Ban on combustion-engine cars w. alternatives available*, .65 for *Ban of polluting vehicles in dense areas*, .42 for *Tax on fossil fuels*, .48 for *Tax on flying (raising price by 20%)*, .71 for *Subsidies for low-carbon technologies*, and .62 for *Support of mandatory and subsidized insulation of buildings*.

Figure A12: Perceived characteristics of a ban on combustion-engine cars



Note: The questions on the effectiveness and fairness have answer options *Strongly disagree/Somewhat disagree/Neither agree nor disagree/Somewhat agree/Strongly agree*. We report the share of respondents who answer "Somewhat agree" or "Strongly agree." Questions on the distributional impacts and self-interest have answer options *Lose a lot/Mostly lose/Neither win nor lose/Mostly win/Win a lot*. Depicted is the share of respondents who say "Mostly win" or "Win a lot." "Support main climate policies" has answer options *Strongly oppose/Somewhat oppose/Neither support nor oppose/Somewhat support/Strongly support*. We show the share of respondents who "Somewhat support" or "Strongly support." The shares represented are based on respondents in the control group only (who did not see any pedagogical videos). For the exact phrasing of each question, see the Questionnaire in Appendix A-5.

Figure A13: Perceived characteristics of a carbon tax with cash transfers



Note: The questions on the effectiveness and fairness have answer options *Strongly disagree/Somewhat disagree/Neither agree nor disagree/Somewhat agree/Strongly agree.* We report the share of respondents who answer "Somewhat agree" or "Strongly agree." Questions on the distributional impacts and self-interest have answer options *Lose a lot/Mostly lose/Neither win nor lose/Mostly win/Win a lot.* Depicted is the share of respondents who say "Mostly win" or "Win a lot." "Support main climate policies" has answer options *Strongly oppose/Somewhat oppose/Neither support nor oppose/Somewhat support/Strongly support.* We show the share of respondents who "Somewhat support" or "Strongly support." The shares represented are based on respondents in the control group only (who did not see any pedagogical videos). For the exact phrasing of each question, see the Questionnaire in Appendix A-5.

Figure A14: Perceived characteristics of a green infrastructure program



Note: The questions on the effectiveness and fairness have answer options *Strongly disagree/Somewhat disagree/Neither agree nor disagree/Somewhat agree/Strongly agree*. We report the share of respondents who answer "Somewhat agree" or "Strongly agree." Questions on the distributional impacts and self-interest have answer options *Lose a lot/Mostly lose/Neither win nor lose/Mostly win/Win a lot*. Depicted is the share of respondents who say "Mostly win" or "Win a lot." "Support main climate policies" has answer options *Strongly oppose/Somewhat oppose/Neither support nor oppose/Somewhat support/Strongly support*. We show the share of respondents who "Somewhat support" or "Strongly support." The shares represented are based on respondents in the control group only (who did not see any pedagogical videos). For the exact phrasing of each question, see the Questionnaire in Appendix A-5.

Figure A15: Share of respondents who hold key beliefs about the main climate policies by socioeconomic characteristics, energy usage, and treatment group in high-income countries





(C) Share who believes low-income earners would lose from [policy]



Note: The figure shows the share of respondents who agree (somewhat or strongly) with the statement. Means are shown by socioeconomic characteristics, treatment group, and energy usage. Except for the rows labeled "Treatment," the means are taken over respondents in the control group only (who did not see any pedagogical videos). A 95% confidence interval is displayed. See Appendix A-1 for variable detailed definitions.

Figure A16: Share of respondents who hold key beliefs about the main climate policies by socioeconomic characteristics, energy usage, and treatment group in middle-income countries





(C) Share who believes low-income earners would lose from [policy]



Note: The figure shows the share of respondents who agree (somewhat or strongly) with the statement. Means are shown by socioeconomic characteristics, treatment group, and energy usage. Except for the rows labeled "Treatment," the means are taken over respondents in the control group only (who did not see any pedagogical videos). A 95% confidence interval is displayed. See Appendix A-1 for variable detailed definitions.

Figure A17: Beliefs underlying policy support, views on fairness, and willingness to change behaviors

(A) Correlation between the *"Fairness of main climate policies," "Support for main climate policies,"* and *"Willingness to adopt climate-friendly behavior"* indices and beliefs



(B) Share of the variation in *"Fairness of main climate polcies"* (left, R^2: 0.70) and *"Willingness to adopt climate-friendly behavior"* (right, R^2: 0.50) indices explained by different beliefs



Note: Panel A shows the results of regressions of indices on standardized variables measuring respondent's beliefs and perceptions. Country fixed effects, treatment indicators, and individual socioeconomic characteristics are included but not displayed. Panel B depicts the share of the variance in the *Fairness of main climate policies* and *Willingness to adopt climate-friendly behaviors* indices that is explained by each belief and perception, conditional on country fixed effects, treatment indicators, and individual socioeconomic characteristics. See Figure 12 for the variance decomposition of the support and details on the method. See Appendix A-1 for detailed variable definitions.

Figure A18: Climate attitudes by treatment group



Note: This figure displays the mean of indicator variables by treatment group. Support for policy is an indicator variable equal to 1 if the respondent supports the policy somewhat or strongly. *Fairness of main climate policies* is an indicator variable equal 1 if on average the respondent somewhat or strongly agrees that each climate policy is fair. *Willing to donate to reforestation cause* equals 1 if the respondent is willing to donate a share of the money prize. *Willing to adopt climate-friendly behavior* is an indicator variable equal 1 if on average the respondent is willing to adopt each climate-friendly behavior a lot or a great deal. *Willing to sign petition supporting climate action* equals 1 if the respondent is willing to sign a petition supporting climate action.

Figure A19: Effects of the treatments on the support for a carbon tax depending on the use of its revenue



Note: The figure shows the coefficients from a regression of the indicator variables listed on the left, capturing support for a carbon tax depending on the use of its revenue, on indicators for each treatment, controlling for country fixed effects and socioeconomic characteristics (not shown). Control group mean support is given in the legend. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

Figure A20: Absolute support for global climate policies.



Note: Opposition or support is asked on a 5-point scale with "Indifferent" as the middle option. Absolute support is the percentage of "somewhat" or "strong support". *In Denmark, France, and the U.S., the questions with an asterisk were asked differently. For the exact phrasing of each question, see Appendix A-5.

Figure A21: Relative support for global climate policies.



Note: Opposition or support is asked on a 5-point scale with "Indifferent" as the middle option. Absolute support is the percentage of "somewhat" or "strong support", excluding "Indifferent" answers. *In Denmark, France, and the U.S., the questions with an asterisk were asked differently. For the exact phrasing of each question, see Appendix A-5.

A-4 Regression tables

Table A1: Correlation between knowledge and individual characteristics

	Knowledge of climate change				
	Knowledge index	Footprint	Fundamentals	Greenhouse gases	Impacts
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Control group mean	-0.075	-0.033	-0.034	-0.118	-0.003
Panel A: Socio-economic indicators					
Gender: Woman	−0.139***	−0.084***	−0.004	−0.133***	−0.127***
	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)
Lives with child(ren) under 14	−0.122***	−0.093***	−0.026*	−0.092***	−0.087***
	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.014)
Age: 25 - 34	−0.084***	−0.009	−0.107***	−0.071***	−0.042*
	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.024)	(0.023)
Age: 35 - 49	−0.062***	0.010	−0.101***	−0.099***	0.018
	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.023)	(0.022)
Age: 50 or older	0.092***	0.151***	−0.080***	0.005	0.119***
	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.021)	(0.020)
Household income: Q2	0.093***	0.034**	0.045***	0.099***	0.064***
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Household income: Q3	0.116***	0.067***	0.046***	0.102***	0.076***
	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)
Household income: Q4	0.188***	0.125***	0.059***	0.137***	0.145***
	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.018)
Highest diploma: College	0.402***	0.222***	0.217***	0.284***	0.295***
	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.025)	(0.024)
Highest diploma: High school	0.235***	0.100***	0.143***	0.180***	0.185***
	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.025)	(0.024)
Economic Leaning: Very Left	−0.031	−0.048*	0.083***	−0.026	−0.075***
	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.027)
Economic Leaning: Center	−0.213***	−0.159***	−0.168***	−0.091***	−0.102***
	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.017)
Economic Leaning: Right	−0.292***	−0.169***	−0.318***	−0.102***	−0.144***
	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)
Economic Leaning: Very Right	−0.420***	−0.275***	−0.294***	−0.168***	−0.309***
	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.024)
Treatment: Climate Impacts	0.146***	0.059***	0.101***	0.173***	0.040**
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.016)
Treatment: Climate Policies	0.039**	0.020	−0.008	0.124***	−0.041**
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.017)
Treatment: Both	0.102***	0.030*	0.044***	0.188***	0.002
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Panel B: Energy usage indicators					
Agglomeration size: Small	−0.002	0.021	−0.018	−0.037*	0.021
	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)
Agglomeration size: Medium	0.048**	0.041*	0.035	0.002	0.037*
	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)
Agglomeration size: Large	0.056***	0.044**	0.051**	−0.007	0.050**
	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)
Public transport available	0.028**	−0.023*	0.036***	0.029**	0.047***
	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)
Uses car	0.052***	0.004	0.035**	0.043**	0.061***
	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)
High gas expenses	−0.072***	−0.055***	−0.027**	−0.045***	−0.049***
	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.013)
High heating expenses	−0.019	−0.034***	0.002	0.006	−0.014
	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)
Flies more than once a year	0.037***	0.018	0.056***	−0.003	0.024*
	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)
Works in polluting sector	−0.153***	−0.096***	−0.061***	−0.103***	−0.123***
	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.018)
Eats beef/meat weekly or more	−0.045***	−0.055***	−0.070***	0.045***	−0.021
	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)
Owner or landlord	0.004	−0.021	−0.009	0.024	0.027*
	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)
Observations	40,680	40,680	40,680	40,680	40,680
R^2	0.170	0.154	0.050	0.076	0.074

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of knowledge indices on socioeconomic indicators (Panel A) and on energy usage indicators (Panel B), controlling for country fixed effects. Panel B also controls for socioeconomic indicators, but the coefficients are not displayed. The dependent variable in column 1 is the *Knowledge index*, whose components are the indices in the remaining columns. Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

Table A2: Correlation between *Knowledge index* and individual characteristics in high-income countries

	Knowledge Index											
	AUS	CAN	DEU	DNK	ESP	FRA	GBR	ITA	JPN	KOR	POL	USA
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Control group mean	-0.044	-0.07	-0.02	0.004	-0.065	-0.163	-0.021	-0.032	0.013	-0.065	-0.035	-0.022
Panel A: Socio-economic indicators												
Gender: Woman	−0.054	−0.201***	−0.136***	−0.128**	−0.244***	−0.316***	−0.001	−0.163***	−0.262***	−0.081	−0.176***	−0.102*
	(0.056)	(0.049)	(0.052)	(0.056)	(0.044)	(0.059)	(0.052)	(0.047)	(0.054)	(0.056)	(0.048)	(0.053)
Lives with child(ren) under 14	−0.202***	−0.216***	−0.247***	−0.090	−0.113**	−0.210***	−0.262***	−0.194***	−0.075	−0.131*	−0.057	−0.255***
	(0.067)	(0.055)	(0.072)	(0.069)	(0.051)	(0.070)	(0.064)	(0.060)	(0.076)	(0.068)	(0.052)	(0.056)
Age: 25 - 34	−0.218**	−0.068	−0.325***	0.025	−0.178**	−0.055	0.028	−0.169	0.266**	−0.395***	−0.234**	0.013
	(0.090)	(0.114)	(0.116)	(0.135)	(0.090)	(0.112)	(0.089)	(0.106)	(0.124)	(0.107)	(0.103)	(0.099)
Age: 35 - 49	−0.223**	−0.019	−0.168	−0.005	−0.076	−0.023	0.145	−0.142	0.149	−0.418***	−0.064	−0.062
	(0.091)	(0.107)	(0.113)	(0.130)	(0.080)	(0.106)	(0.090)	(0.093)	(0.116)	(0.098)	(0.097)	(0.097)
Age: 50 or older	−0.023	0.129	0.017	0.300**	0.122*	0.025	0.283***	−0.101	0.178*	−0.449***	0.052	0.292***
	(0.083)	(0.100)	(0.107)	(0.125)	(0.073)	(0.100)	(0.084)	(0.085)	(0.108)	(0.097)	(0.092)	(0.093)
Household income: Q2	0.091	0.151**	0.016	−0.075	0.161***	−0.034	0.098	0.196***	−0.013	0.100	0.216***	−0.038
	(0.056)	(0.070)	(0.070)	(0.084)	(0.061)	(0.072)	(0.065)	(0.063)	(0.077)	(0.066)	(0.069)	(0.068)
Household income: Q3	0.086	0.237***	0.064	0.056	0.224***	0.051	0.256***	0.268***	−0.035	0.082	0.267***	0.014
	(0.068)	(0.071)	(0.077)	(0.075)	(0.065)	(0.079)	(0.072)	(0.068)	(0.072)	(0.065)	(0.067)	(0.075)
Household income: Q4	0.291***	0.436***	0.153**	0.151*	0.189***	−0.079	0.256***	0.285***	0.082	0.043	0.346***	0.099
	(0.092)	(0.079)	(0.075)	(0.085)	(0.066)	(0.100)	(0.072)	(0.070)	(0.074)	(0.092)	(0.073)	(0.084)
Highest diploma: College	0.306***	0.105	0.701***	0.579***	0.367***	0.400***	0.257***	0.413***	0.698***	0.640***	0.486**	0.385***
	(0.096)	(0.078)	(0.090)	(0.111)	(0.071)	(0.092)	(0.080)	(0.078)	(0.262)	(0.192)	(0.206)	(0.125)
Highest diploma: High school	0.095	0.032	0.467***	0.331***	0.245***	0.112	0.182**	0.167**	0.546**	0.344*	0.313	0.286**
	(0.091)	(0.076)	(0.079)	(0.103)	(0.072)	(0.081)	(0.079)	(0.072)	(0.261)	(0.199)	(0.202)	(0.122)
Economic Leaning: Very Left	−0.010	−0.079	−0.114	0.343**	0.122*	−0.611**	−0.054	0.106	−0.195	−0.160	−0.205**	−0.121
	(0.144)	(0.109)	(0.138)	(0.150)	(0.073)	(0.286)	(0.107)	(0.080)	(0.144)	(0.183)	(0.098)	(0.109)
Economic Leaning: Center	−0.323***	−0.378***	−0.376***	−0.103	−0.211***	0.073	−0.472***	−0.206***	−0.297***	−0.285***	−0.200***	−0.232***
	(0.079)	(0.070)	(0.062)	(0.065)	(0.052)	(0.084)	(0.064)	(0.060)	(0.077)	(0.082)	(0.063)	(0.078)
Economic Leaning: Right	−0.638***	−0.570***	−0.566***	−0.298***	−0.415***	−0.183**	−0.494***	−0.162**	−0.260***	−0.227**	−0.265***	−0.546***
	(0.094)	(0.087)	(0.091)	(0.074)	(0.070)	(0.087)	(0.077)	(0.065)	(0.087)	(0.094)	(0.086)	(0.089)
Economic Leaning: Very Right	−0.681***	−0.926***	−0.600***	−0.600***	−0.526***	−0.407***	−0.962***	−0.329***	−0.414***	−0.379***	−0.491***	−0.760***
	(0.107)	(0.112)	(0.134)	(0.178)	(0.089)	(0.122)	(0.119)	(0.093)	(0.125)	(0.134)	(0.087)	(0.093)
Treatment: Climate Impacts	0.126*	0.097	0.139**	0.052	0.073	0.243***	0.121*	0.129**	0.079	0.162**	0.125**	0.116
	(0.075)	(0.067)	(0.065)	(0.070)	(0.064)	(0.075)	(0.068)	(0.064)	(0.068)	(0.076)	(0.062)	(0.071)
Treatment: Climate Policies	−0.005	0.101	−0.068	−0.040	0.114*	0.042	0.050	0.003	−0.047	0.028	0.056	−0.017
	(0.072)	(0.066)	(0.068)	(0.069)	(0.061)	(0.081)	(0.065)	(0.067)	(0.072)	(0.079)	(0.063)	(0.068)
Treatment: Both	0.059	0.088	−0.0002	0.028	0.120**	0.194***	0.003	0.116*	−0.043	0.076	0.093	0.058
	(0.074)	(0.066)	(0.067)	(0.075)	(0.058)	(0.071)	(0.069)	(0.063)	(0.072)	(0.073)	(0.064)	(0.072)
Panel B: Energy usage indicators												
Agglomeration size: Small	0.088	0.113	0.103	0.102	0.016	−0.070	0.010	−0.055	0.010	0.184	0.087	0.065
	(0.121)	(0.089)	(0.078)	(0.079)	(0.094)	(0.068)	(0.075)	(0.070)	(0.220)	(0.181)	(0.070)	(0.079)
Agglomeration size: Medium	0.100	0.190**	0.110	−0.065	0.048	−0.055	0.138	0.032	0.097	0.308*	0.137*	0.126
	(0.129)	(0.089)	(0.085)	(0.079)	(0.095)	(0.090)	(0.086)	(0.084)	(0.220)	(0.187)	(0.072)	(0.091)
Agglomeration size: Large	0.229*	0.091	0.150*	0.043	0.041	−0.112	0.050	−0.019	0.022	0.267	0.122	0.094
	(0.119)	(0.087)	(0.083)	(0.090)	(0.092)	(0.115)	(0.084)	(0.089)	(0.218)	(0.175)	(0.076)	(0.083)
Public transport available	0.024	−0.045	0.061	0.072	−0.032	0.110*	0.004	−0.056	0.066	0.113*	0.014	−0.152***
	(0.056)	(0.052)	(0.055)	(0.058)	(0.047)	(0.065)	(0.050)	(0.063)	(0.055)	(0.060)	(0.051)	(0.053)
Uses car	0.222**	0.010	0.176**	−0.063	0.002	0.035	0.032	0.193**	−0.113	0.226***	−0.099	0.246***
	(0.094)	(0.074)	(0.069)	(0.064)	(0.056)	(0.089)	(0.066)	(0.078)	(0.073)	(0.068)	(0.064)	(0.091)
High gas expenses	−0.078	−0.127**	−0.203***	−0.103*	0.035	−0.157**	−0.086	0.039	−0.063	−0.057	−0.045	−0.151***
	(0.060)	(0.053)	(0.055)	(0.056)	(0.047)	(0.064)	(0.060)	(0.049)	(0.066)	(0.061)	(0.051)	(0.054)
High heating expenses	−0.067	0.080	−0.007	−0.001	−0.005	−0.024	−0.105**	0.027	0.029	0.014	0.109**	−0.221***
	(0.058)	(0.051)	(0.053)	(0.056)	(0.047)	(0.058)	(0.051)	(0.050)	(0.056)	(0.056)	(0.050)	(0.053)
Flies more than once a year	0.153**	0.035	0.001	0.121**	0.057	−0.025	−0.084	0.081	−0.027	0.076	0.080	0.095
	(0.063)	(0.056)	(0.056)	(0.054)	(0.047)	(0.073)	(0.058)	(0.052)	(0.059)	(0.063)	(0.057)	(0.059)
Works in polluting sector	−0.104	−0.286***	−0.187**	−0.377***	−0.135*	0.048	−0.244**	−0.084	0.002	−0.218***	−0.128**	−0.186**
	(0.082)	(0.081)	(0.078)	(0.099)	(0.071)	(0.085)	(0.095)	(0.087)	(0.080)	(0.081)	(0.063)	(0.088)
Eats beef/meat weekly or more	−0.072	−0.083*	0.056	−0.187***	−0.146***	−0.077	−0.137**	−0.137***	0.043	0.051	−0.124*	0.180***
	(0.056)	(0.048)	(0.056)	(0.055)	(0.043)	(0.055)	(0.053)	(0.049)	(0.055)	(0.064)	(0.070)	(0.051)
Owner or landlord	−0.0001	−0.008	0.034	−0.011	−0.019	−0.064	0.178***	−0.081	0.122*	−0.019	0.024	−0.179***
	(0.062)	(0.062)	(0.058)	(0.060)	(0.053)	(0.065)	(0.060)	(0.060)	(0.066)	(0.061)	(0.059)	(0.062)
Observations	1,978	2,022	2,006	2,013	2,268	2,006	2,025	2,088	1,990	1,932	2,053	2,218
R^2	0.130	0.142	0.152	0.154	0.116	0.122	0.145	0.088	0.066	0.090	0.096	0.160

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of the *Knowledge index* on socioeconomic indicators (Panel A) and on energy usage indicators (Panel B). Panel B also controls for socioeconomic indicators, but the coefficients are not displayed. Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

Table A3: Correlation between *Knowledge index* and individual characteristics in middle-income countries

	Knowledge Index							
	BRA	CHN	IDN	IND	MEX	TUR	UKR	ZAF
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Control group mean	-0.161	-0.104	-0.106	-0.052	-0.097	-0.051	-0.185	-0.098
Panel A: Socio-economic indicators								
Gender: Woman	−0.179***	−0.127**	−0.091*	−0.184***	−0.194***	−0.128**	−0.101	−0.180***
	(0.062)	(0.064)	(0.048)	(0.058)	(0.064)	(0.065)	(0.063)	(0.057)
Lives with child(ren) under 14	−0.135**	−0.057	−0.033	−0.088	−0.173**	0.094	−0.096	−0.235***
	(0.069)	(0.073)	(0.068)	(0.066)	(0.072)	(0.072)	(0.064)	(0.062)
Age: 25 - 34	−0.226**	0.141	−0.042	−0.036	0.150	−0.238**	0.225	−0.343***
	(0.099)	(0.112)	(0.075)	(0.089)	(0.099)	(0.098)	(0.140)	(0.080)
Age: 35 - 49	−0.032	−0.022	−0.076	−0.075	−0.030	−0.300***	0.333**	−0.427***
	(0.089)	(0.099)	(0.077)	(0.090)	(0.092)	(0.095)	(0.131)	(0.080)
Age: 50 or older	−0.062	0.135	0.016	0.066	0.046	0.138	0.379***	−0.328***
	(0.087)	(0.098)	(0.086)	(0.078)	(0.113)	(0.095)	(0.127)	(0.085)
Household income: Q2	0.261***	0.269***	0.201***	0.294***	−0.050	0.106	0.134	0.053
	(0.082)	(0.093)	(0.072)	(0.088)	(0.086)	(0.099)	(0.093)	(0.087)
Household income: Q3	0.347***	−0.119	0.141	0.214**	−0.093	0.027	0.133	0.100
	(0.092)	(0.109)	(0.086)	(0.098)	(0.098)	(0.110)	(0.095)	(0.091)
Household income: Q4	0.438***	0.027	0.143*	0.369***	−0.005	0.081	0.291***	0.241***
	(0.113)	(0.103)	(0.076)	(0.082)	(0.095)	(0.119)	(0.095)	(0.091)
Highest diploma: College	0.614***	0.521***	0.460***	0.240**	0.508***	0.198*	0.473***	0.451***
	(0.175)	(0.091)	(0.112)	(0.119)	(0.103)	(0.113)	(0.167)	(0.137)
Highest diploma: High school	0.433**	0.268***	0.362***	0.345***	0.420***	0.055	0.141	0.370***
	(0.172)	(0.084)	(0.110)	(0.123)	(0.093)	(0.116)	(0.169)	(0.132)
Economic Leaning: Very Left	0.075	0.251**	−0.174	0.456**	−0.278*	−0.066	0.074	0.216*
	(0.136)	(0.122)	(0.203)	(0.206)	(0.146)	(0.135)	(0.148)	(0.116)
Economic Leaning: Center	−0.081	−0.262***	−0.280***	−0.043	−0.245**	−0.093	0.137	−0.098
	(0.113)	(0.082)	(0.085)	(0.147)	(0.098)	(0.103)	(0.105)	(0.089)
Economic Leaning: Right	−0.138	−0.351***	−0.319***	−0.005	−0.241**	−0.034	0.221*	0.024
	(0.131)	(0.095)	(0.099)	(0.153)	(0.117)	(0.136)	(0.121)	(0.102)
Economic Leaning: Very Right	−0.141	−0.367***	−0.141	−0.288*	−0.476***	−0.328**	0.087	−0.107
	(0.119)	(0.120)	(0.095)	(0.152)	(0.135)	(0.137)	(0.125)	(0.108)
Treatment: Climate Impacts	0.238***	0.139	0.234***	0.049	0.194**	0.049	0.294***	0.257***
	(0.083)	(0.094)	(0.063)	(0.077)	(0.078)	(0.090)	(0.085)	(0.078)
Treatment: Climate Policies	0.232***	0.119	0.053	0.027	0.070	0.047	0.088	0.020
	(0.090)	(0.089)	(0.059)	(0.080)	(0.095)	(0.091)	(0.092)	(0.075)
Treatment: Both	0.189**	0.058	0.184***	0.134*	0.124	0.091	0.270***	0.153*
	(0.086)	(0.085)	(0.059)	(0.081)	(0.083)	(0.083)	(0.085)	(0.083)
Panel B: Energy usage indicators								
Agglomeration size: Small	−0.030	−0.094	0.093	−0.128	−0.243*	−0.223	0.016	−0.090
	(0.158)	(0.100)	(0.077)	(0.082)	(0.130)	(0.214)	(0.117)	(0.095)
Agglomeration size: Medium	0.061	0.015	0.136	−0.021	−0.001	−0.396*	0.075	−0.058
	(0.159)	(0.126)	(0.090)	(0.128)	(0.153)	(0.223)	(0.118)	(0.111)
Agglomeration size: Large	0.040	0.219*	0.210***	−0.021	0.004	−0.384*	0.246**	−0.046
	(0.153)	(0.126)	(0.073)	(0.092)	(0.126)	(0.198)	(0.108)	(0.092)
Public transport available	0.034	−0.011	0.093	0.131*	0.051	0.130**	−0.032	−0.105*
	(0.065)	(0.077)	(0.062)	(0.070)	(0.073)	(0.065)	(0.063)	(0.059)
Uses car	0.016	0.138**	0.676***	−0.013	0.061	0.057	0.002	0.157**
	(0.082)	(0.069)	(0.179)	(0.068)	(0.081)	(0.080)	(0.067)	(0.073)
High gas expenses	0.011	0.026	−0.111**		0.051	−0.009	−0.108	−0.026
	(0.067)	(0.067)	(0.055)		(0.068)	(0.071)	(0.070)	(0.061)
High heating expenses		−0.100				0.065	0.003	0.045
		(0.073)				(0.072)	(0.063)	(0.060)
Flies more than once a year	0.037	0.134	0.157***	−0.182**	−0.034	−0.031	−0.129*	−0.156**
	(0.079)	(0.083)	(0.055)	(0.079)	(0.079)	(0.077)	(0.072)	(0.071)
Works in polluting sector	−0.313***	0.044	−0.237***	−0.100	−0.236***	0.060	−0.282***	0.035
	(0.088)	(0.065)	(0.066)	(0.080)	(0.080)	(0.087)	(0.071)	(0.073)
Eats beef/meat weekly or more	0.122	0.003	−0.094	−0.161**	−0.041	0.013	−0.042	0.013
	(0.075)	(0.083)	(0.061)	(0.078)	(0.063)	(0.073)	(0.068)	(0.057)
Owner or landlord	0.035	0.111	0.153	0.0002	−0.134*	0.003	0.132*	−0.023
	(0.067)	(0.084)	(0.094)	(0.098)	(0.079)	(0.072)	(0.072)	(0.063)
Observations	1,860	1,717	2,488	2,472	2,045	1,932	1,564	2,003
R^2	0.114	0.121	0.085	0.095	0.088	0.061	0.139	0.100

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of the *Knowledge index* on socioeconomic indicators (Panel A) and on energy usage indicators (Panel B). Panel B also controls for socioeconomic indicators, but the coefficients are not displayed. Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

Table A4: Correlation between support for the main climate policies and individual characteristics

	Support			
	Main climate policies index	Green infrastructure program	Ban on combustion-engine cars	Carbon tax with cash transfers
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Control group mean	-0.081	0.656	0.517	0.46
Panel A: Socio-economic indicators				
Gender: Woman	0.048***	0.010*	0.006	−0.011*
	(0.012)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Lives with child(ren) under 14	0.123***	0.034***	0.051***	0.057***
	(0.013)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Age: 25 - 34	0.019	−0.0004	0.008	0.004
	(0.020)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.011)
Age: 35 - 49	0.046**	0.014	0.032***	0.022**
	(0.019)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.010)
Age: 50 or older	0.125***	0.061***	0.083***	0.074***
	(0.018)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Household income: Q2	0.053***	0.033***	0.030***	0.012
	(0.016)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Household income: Q3	0.073***	0.043***	0.040***	0.021**
	(0.017)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.009)
Household income: Q4	0.061***	0.045***	0.041***	0.025***
	(0.018)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.009)
Highest diploma: College	0.141***	0.097***	0.090***	0.070***
	(0.022)	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.012)
Highest diploma: High school	0.079***	0.060***	0.053***	0.045***
	(0.021)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)
Economic Leaning: Very Left	0.111***	0.0003	0.026*	0.030**
	(0.027)	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.014)
Economic Leaning: Center	−0.223***	−0.111***	−0.103***	−0.098***
	(0.016)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.009)
Economic Leaning: Right	−0.329***	−0.120***	−0.104***	−0.077***
	(0.019)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Economic Leaning: Very Right	−0.268***	−0.136***	−0.089***	−0.079***
	(0.025)	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.012)
Treatment: Climate Impacts	0.052***	0.021***	0.019**	0.030***
	(0.015)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Treatment: Climate Policies	0.120***	0.025***	0.043***	0.097***
	(0.016)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Treatment: Both	0.194***	0.049***	0.072***	0.128***
	(0.016)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Panel B: Energy usage indicators				
Agglomeration size: Small	0.047**	0.015*	0.009	−0.006
	(0.019)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)
Agglomeration size: Medium	0.049**	0.027***	0.014	0.001
	(0.021)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.011)
Agglomeration size: Large	0.084***	0.030***	0.029***	0.007
	(0.020)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Public transport available	0.252***	0.085***	0.089***	0.102***
	(0.012)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Uses car	−0.147***	−0.023***	−0.059***	−0.044***
	(0.015)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)
High gas expenses	−0.066***	−0.021***	−0.022***	−0.019***
	(0.012)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.006)
High heating expenses	0.037***	0.031***	0.026***	0.025***
	(0.013)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Flies more than once a year	0.125***	0.044***	0.057***	0.065***
	(0.014)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Works in polluting sector	0.011	0.001	−0.004	0.012
	(0.016)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Eats beef/meat weekly or more	−0.078***	−0.034***	−0.032***	−0.013**
	(0.012)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Owner or landlord	0.026*	0.011	0.013*	0.018**
	(0.014)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Observations	40,680	40,680	40,680	40,680
R^2	0.177	0.115	0.110	0.120

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of the variables listed in the columns on socioeconomic characteristics (Panel A) and on energy usage characteristics (Panel B), controlling for country fixed effects. Panel B also controls for socioeconomic characteristics, but the coefficients are not displayed. The dependent variable in column 1 is the *Support for main policies index*, while the remaining columns are indicator variables equal to 1 if the respondent (somewhat or strongly) supports each of the policies. Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

Table A5: Correlation between *Support for main climate policies index* and individual characteristics in high-income countries

	Support for main climate policies index											
	AUS	CAN	DEU	DNK	ESP	FRA	GBR	ITA	JPN	KOR	POL	USA
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Control group mean	-0.206	-0.099	-0.095	-0.138	-0.1	-0.088	-0.11	-0.187	-0.101	-0.054	-0.048	0.03
Panel A: Socio-economic indicators												
Gender: Woman	−0.008	−0.105**	−0.061	0.162***	0.058	0.077	0.051	0.024	0.199***	−0.061	0.059	0.045
	(0.057)	(0.049)	(0.052)	(0.052)	(0.043)	(0.057)	(0.053)	(0.047)	(0.055)	(0.054)	(0.047)	(0.053)
Lives with child(ren) under 14	0.169***	0.167***	0.056	−0.055	0.109**	0.201***	0.121*	0.149**	0.079	0.049	0.176***	0.033
	(0.063)	(0.055)	(0.069)	(0.065)	(0.049)	(0.065)	(0.063)	(0.063)	(0.069)	(0.071)	(0.053)	(0.055)
Age: 25 - 34	−0.080	−0.024	−0.156	0.012	0.038	−0.133	−0.037	−0.189*	0.133	0.063	−0.120	0.102
	(0.087)	(0.098)	(0.105)	(0.108)	(0.079)	(0.101)	(0.089)	(0.101)	(0.108)	(0.107)	(0.088)	(0.088)
Age: 35 - 49	−0.099	−0.214**	−0.093	−0.075	−0.084	−0.319***	0.134	−0.107	0.223**	0.149	−0.026	0.089
	(0.091)	(0.094)	(0.103)	(0.099)	(0.072)	(0.094)	(0.089)	(0.090)	(0.105)	(0.101)	(0.080)	(0.090)
Age: 50 or older	−0.223***	−0.092	−0.134	−0.033	0.032	−0.397***	−0.045	−0.110	0.418***	0.417***	0.227***	−0.199**
	(0.085)	(0.088)	(0.100)	(0.097)	(0.066)	(0.094)	(0.083)	(0.082)	(0.097)	(0.090)	(0.076)	(0.083)
Household income: Q2	0.072	0.042	−0.066	−0.062	0.107*	−0.078	−0.047	0.072	0.141**	0.066	0.158**	0.013
	(0.054)	(0.071)	(0.075)	(0.074)	(0.060)	(0.068)	(0.070)	(0.061)	(0.066)	(0.070)	(0.067)	(0.063)
Household income: Q3	0.150**	0.026	0.018	−0.005	0.119*	−0.034	0.011	0.119*	0.157**	0.134**	0.115*	−0.029
	(0.072)	(0.073)	(0.075)	(0.074)	(0.063)	(0.079)	(0.071)	(0.067)	(0.069)	(0.067)	(0.066)	(0.078)
Household income: Q4	0.018	0.030	−0.106	−0.078	0.090	−0.089	0.034	0.194***	0.107	0.118	0.155**	0.080
	(0.093)	(0.081)	(0.076)	(0.089)	(0.064)	(0.088)	(0.079)	(0.073)	(0.079)	(0.088)	(0.072)	(0.085)
Highest diploma: College	0.263**	−0.020	0.021	0.223**	0.159**	0.029	0.303***	0.187**	0.316	−0.683***	−0.160	0.275**
	(0.109)	(0.085)	(0.084)	(0.100)	(0.069)	(0.097)	(0.081)	(0.083)	(0.198)	(0.170)	(0.177)	(0.117)
Highest diploma: High school	0.035	−0.139*	−0.122	0.164*	0.128*	−0.082	0.134*	0.113	0.179	−0.751***	−0.164	0.137
	(0.102)	(0.081)	(0.075)	(0.093)	(0.070)	(0.084)	(0.076)	(0.069)	(0.196)	(0.174)	(0.174)	(0.110)
Economic Leaning: Very Left	0.023	0.088	0.097	0.491***	0.099	−0.444**	0.042	0.018	0.264	0.047	−0.093	0.284***
	(0.124)	(0.103)	(0.139)	(0.141)	(0.073)	(0.224)	(0.128)	(0.082)	(0.199)	(0.170)	(0.101)	(0.096)
Economic Leaning: Center	−0.502***	−0.366***	−0.398***	−0.254***	−0.279***	−0.094	−0.446***	−0.284***	−0.206***	−0.441***	−0.107*	−0.331***
	(0.075)	(0.069)	(0.068)	(0.067)	(0.052)	(0.086)	(0.068)	(0.058)	(0.076)	(0.072)	(0.064)	(0.065)
Economic Leaning: Right	−0.697***	−0.585***	−0.746***	−0.661***	−0.583***	−0.274***	−0.440***	−0.287***	−0.305***	−0.484***	−0.332***	−0.757***
	(0.092)	(0.085)	(0.090)	(0.076)	(0.068)	(0.085)	(0.085)	(0.068)	(0.097)	(0.087)	(0.081)	(0.083)
Economic Leaning: Very Right	−0.731***	−0.695***	−0.776***	−0.682***	−0.730***	−0.581***	−0.393***	−0.549***	−0.695***	−0.480***	−0.428***	−0.824***
	(0.155)	(0.130)	(0.166)	(0.194)	(0.095)	(0.120)	(0.127)	(0.106)	(0.161)	(0.160)	(0.102)	(0.096)
Treatment: Climate Impacts	0.221***	0.003	0.022	0.151**	0.010	0.058	0.060	0.141**	0.046	−0.007	0.042	−0.097
	(0.077)	(0.069)	(0.068)	(0.068)	(0.060)	(0.072)	(0.067)	(0.067)	(0.069)	(0.072)	(0.062)	(0.068)
Treatment: Climate Policies	0.272***	0.222***	0.189***	0.128*	0.107*	0.058	0.128*	0.300***	0.171**	0.077	0.102	−0.031
	(0.074)	(0.068)	(0.072)	(0.069)	(0.062)	(0.075)	(0.069)	(0.061)	(0.070)	(0.074)	(0.064)	(0.071)
Treatment: Both	0.334***	0.193***	0.183***	0.288***	0.284***	0.207***	0.311***	0.350***	0.189***	0.199***	0.124*	0.061
	(0.081)	(0.066)	(0.068)	(0.072)	(0.058)	(0.080)	(0.069)	(0.066)	(0.072)	(0.070)	(0.064)	(0.072)
Panel B: Energy usage indicators												
Agglomeration size: Small	0.134	0.084	−0.004	0.273***	0.045	0.112	0.112	0.206***	0.051	0.042	−0.013	0.045
	(0.111)	(0.087)	(0.078)	(0.074)	(0.085)	(0.070)	(0.077)	(0.070)	(0.169)	(0.189)	(0.067)	(0.075)
Agglomeration size: Medium	0.130	0.123	0.003	0.278***	0.088	0.119	0.151*	0.162**	0.092	0.086	−0.016	−0.004
	(0.115)	(0.090)	(0.086)	(0.074)	(0.086)	(0.094)	(0.091)	(0.082)	(0.169)	(0.195)	(0.072)	(0.084)
Agglomeration size: Large	0.085	0.090	0.012	0.273***	0.079	0.186*	0.241***	0.033	0.072	0.012	−0.006	0.198**
	(0.109)	(0.085)	(0.087)	(0.080)	(0.084)	(0.107)	(0.086)	(0.090)	(0.167)	(0.185)	(0.074)	(0.080)
Public transport available	0.335***	0.276***	0.251***	0.270***	0.236***	0.232***	0.226***	0.197***	0.031	0.196***	0.187***	0.327***
	(0.055)	(0.052)	(0.053)	(0.053)	(0.046)	(0.061)	(0.051)	(0.059)	(0.057)	(0.055)	(0.051)	(0.053)
Uses car	−0.325***	−0.232***	−0.295***	−0.140**	−0.228***	−0.440***	−0.354***	−0.188***	−0.222***	−0.159**	−0.298***	−0.007
	(0.079)	(0.068)	(0.064)	(0.058)	(0.054)	(0.087)	(0.063)	(0.071)	(0.071)	(0.063)	(0.061)	(0.080)
High gas expenses	−0.028	−0.157***	−0.230***	−0.198***	0.039	−0.026	−0.013	0.133***	−0.083	−0.039	−0.050	−0.033
	(0.058)	(0.052)	(0.056)	(0.052)	(0.047)	(0.060)	(0.058)	(0.047)	(0.064)	(0.057)	(0.049)	(0.052)
High heating expenses	0.095*	0.076	0.104*	0.033	−0.007	0.010	−0.012	−0.049	0.084	0.134**	0.120**	0.087*
	(0.056)	(0.053)	(0.053)	(0.054)	(0.045)	(0.058)	(0.050)	(0.049)	(0.051)	(0.053)	(0.052)	(0.053)
Flies more than once a year	0.174***	0.112**	0.132**	0.071	0.158***	0.096	−0.109**	0.192***	0.159***	0.151***	0.126**	0.101*
	(0.058)	(0.055)	(0.058)	(0.050)	(0.045)	(0.074)	(0.053)	(0.052)	(0.061)	(0.056)	(0.061)	(0.055)
Works in polluting sector	−0.089	−0.121	0.123*	−0.035	0.071	0.182**	0.003	0.061	−0.057	0.073	0.059	0.058
	(0.077)	(0.075)	(0.074)	(0.087)	(0.068)	(0.076)	(0.089)	(0.084)	(0.073)	(0.068)	(0.062)	(0.083)
Eats beef/meat weekly or more	−0.135***	−0.118**	−0.163***	−0.297***	−0.228***	−0.225***	−0.063	−0.043	0.052	0.014	−0.050	−0.097*
	(0.052)	(0.049)	(0.058)	(0.052)	(0.043)	(0.054)	(0.051)	(0.048)	(0.056)	(0.061)	(0.066)	(0.055)
Owner or landlord	0.099	0.082	0.007	−0.060	−0.035	0.069	0.083	−0.016	0.161***	0.017	−0.007	−0.109
	(0.060)	(0.059)	(0.056)	(0.059)	(0.049)	(0.067)	(0.058)	(0.060)	(0.058)	(0.059)	(0.059)	(0.067)
Observations	1,978	2,022	2,006	2,013	2,268	2,006	2,025	2,088	1,990	1,932	2,053	2,218
R^2	0.179	0.128	0.148	0.220	0.135	0.152	0.132	0.096	0.089	0.117	0.073	0.220

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of *Support for main policies index* on socioeconomic indicators (Panel A) and on energy usage indicators (Panel B). Panel B also controls for socioeconomic indicators, but the coefficients are not displayed. Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

Table A6: Correlation between *Support for main climate policies index* and individual characteristics in middle-income countries

	Support for main climate policies index							
	BRA	CHN	IDN	IND	MEX	TUR	UKR	ZAF
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Control group mean	-0.161	-0.117	-0.054	-0.059	-0.067	-0.041	-0.117	-0.113
Panel A: Socio-economic indicators								
Gender: Woman	0.100	0.031	0.081*	0.054	−0.119*	−0.011	0.026	−0.143**
	(0.064)	(0.066)	(0.042)	(0.056)	(0.064)	(0.066)	(0.063)	(0.061)
Lives with child(ren) under 14	0.147**	−0.117	0.289***	0.075	0.141**	0.363***	−0.061	0.098
	(0.071)	(0.087)	(0.057)	(0.063)	(0.064)	(0.072)	(0.067)	(0.066)
Age: 25 - 34	−0.006	0.364***	0.097	0.196**	0.065	0.065	0.045	−0.066
	(0.094)	(0.124)	(0.063)	(0.088)	(0.091)	(0.098)	(0.116)	(0.084)
Age: 35 - 49	0.287***	0.470***	0.237***	0.160*	0.083	0.034	0.174*	−0.099
	(0.084)	(0.114)	(0.061)	(0.087)	(0.085)	(0.087)	(0.098)	(0.083)
Age: 50 or older	0.242***	0.688***	0.532***	0.500***	0.358***	0.521***	0.167	0.060
	(0.083)	(0.108)	(0.072)	(0.074)	(0.090)	(0.089)	(0.103)	(0.092)
Household income: Q2	0.045	−0.015	0.282***	0.254***	0.023	0.111	0.239**	0.033
	(0.086)	(0.109)	(0.060)	(0.087)	(0.085)	(0.092)	(0.099)	(0.088)
Household income: Q3	0.250***	0.094	0.332***	0.371***	0.023	−0.056	0.192*	−0.057
	(0.095)	(0.119)	(0.069)	(0.093)	(0.094)	(0.101)	(0.105)	(0.089)
Household income: Q4	0.168	0.193*	0.429***	0.309***	0.007	0.194*	0.246**	−0.173*
	(0.102)	(0.102)	(0.067)	(0.073)	(0.104)	(0.107)	(0.101)	(0.098)
Highest diploma: College	0.312**	0.370***	0.466***	0.726***	0.263***	0.181*	0.131	0.070
	(0.142)	(0.106)	(0.107)	(0.135)	(0.092)	(0.093)	(0.238)	(0.132)
Highest diploma: High school	0.250*	0.394***	0.422***	0.500***	0.218**	−0.069	0.261	0.031
	(0.138)	(0.101)	(0.105)	(0.133)	(0.087)	(0.100)	(0.238)	(0.124)
Economic Leaning: Very Left	0.155	0.420**	0.117	0.376**	0.082	0.342***	0.090	0.475***
	(0.117)	(0.164)	(0.161)	(0.186)	(0.153)	(0.119)	(0.169)	(0.135)
Economic Leaning: Center	−0.224**	0.225**	−0.124	0.105	−0.158	0.032	0.141	−0.009
	(0.091)	(0.088)	(0.078)	(0.122)	(0.111)	(0.100)	(0.119)	(0.092)
Economic Leaning: Right	−0.225**	0.186**	0.009	0.182	0.124	0.047	0.427***	0.100
	(0.108)	(0.094)	(0.085)	(0.129)	(0.116)	(0.121)	(0.129)	(0.107)
Economic Leaning: Very Right	−0.265**	0.557***	0.479***	0.264*	−0.075	−0.145	0.520***	0.157
	(0.110)	(0.169)	(0.089)	(0.136)	(0.139)	(0.133)	(0.127)	(0.126)
Treatment: Climate Impacts	0.142*	0.154*	0.051	0.018	0.097	−0.114	0.039	0.110
	(0.085)	(0.091)	(0.053)	(0.076)	(0.081)	(0.087)	(0.081)	(0.082)
Treatment: Climate Policies	0.187**	0.074	0.075	0.116	0.040	0.137	0.173**	0.186**
	(0.088)	(0.093)	(0.055)	(0.076)	(0.090)	(0.089)	(0.088)	(0.082)
Treatment: Both	0.348***	0.239***	0.141***	0.073	0.164**	0.115	0.227**	0.253***
	(0.087)	(0.092)	(0.053)	(0.081)	(0.082)	(0.082)	(0.091)	(0.086)
Panel B: Energy usage indicators								
Agglomeration size: Small	−0.043	0.091	0.063	0.107	0.087	0.512**	−0.065	0.025
	(0.158)	(0.108)	(0.061)	(0.082)	(0.122)	(0.220)	(0.116)	(0.100)
Agglomeration size: Medium	0.210	−0.052	0.109	0.049	0.189	0.208	−0.064	−0.098
	(0.156)	(0.137)	(0.075)	(0.116)	(0.129)	(0.211)	(0.124)	(0.125)
Agglomeration size: Large	0.228	0.215	0.031	0.108	0.122	0.414**	−0.005	−0.014
	(0.151)	(0.132)	(0.065)	(0.091)	(0.115)	(0.200)	(0.118)	(0.101)
Public transport available	0.193***	0.069	0.350***	0.180***	0.036	0.166***	0.114	0.257***
	(0.068)	(0.079)	(0.052)	(0.067)	(0.084)	(0.060)	(0.071)	(0.060)
Uses car	−0.029	0.160**	0.271**	0.286***	−0.120	−0.003	−0.029	−0.099
	(0.084)	(0.074)	(0.108)	(0.070)	(0.077)	(0.074)	(0.079)	(0.070)
High gas expenses	0.020	−0.031	−0.080*		−0.131**	−0.022	−0.108	−0.029
	(0.065)	(0.083)	(0.045)		(0.065)	(0.073)	(0.078)	(0.064)
High heating expenses		0.033				−0.275***	0.016	0.135**
		(0.080)				(0.073)	(0.066)	(0.061)
Flies more than once a year	0.093	0.097	0.249***	−0.208***	0.209***	0.232***	−0.225**	0.182**
	(0.078)	(0.091)	(0.049)	(0.078)	(0.074)	(0.075)	(0.094)	(0.076)
Works in polluting sector	−0.315***	0.276***	−0.173***	−0.090	0.029	0.127*	0.039	0.016
	(0.089)	(0.069)	(0.055)	(0.080)	(0.071)	(0.075)	(0.078)	(0.081)
Eats beef/meat weekly or more	−0.002	−0.132	0.015	0.157**	0.048	0.112*	0.033	−0.076
	(0.073)	(0.083)	(0.042)	(0.072)	(0.065)	(0.066)	(0.073)	(0.062)
Owner or landlord	−0.010	0.140	0.242***	0.300***	0.093	0.072	0.079	0.062
	(0.068)	(0.086)	(0.071)	(0.086)	(0.076)	(0.069)	(0.078)	(0.064)
Observations	1,860	1,717	2,488	2,472	2,045	1,932	1,564	2,003
R^2	0.107	0.139	0.360	0.191	0.066	0.169	0.079	0.078

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of the *Support for main policies index* on socioeconomic indicators (Panel A) and on energy usage indicators (Panel B). Panel B also controls for socioeconomic indicators, but the coefficients are not displayed. Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

Table A7: Correlation between support for the three main climate policies and beliefs

	Support			
	Main climate policies index	Green infrastructure program	Ban on combustion-engine cars	Carbon tax with cash transfers
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Control group mean	-0.081	0.656	0.517	0.46
Trusts the governement	0.039***	0.008***	0.007**	0.024***
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Believes inequality is an important problem	0.038***	0.013***	0.010***	0.027***
	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Worries about the consequences of CC	0.044***	0.019***	0.012***	0.004
	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Believes net-zero is technically feasible	0.022***	0.010***	0.009***	0.001
	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Believes will suffer from climate change	0.051***	0.020***	0.028***	0.009***
	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Understands emission across activities/regions	0.011***	0.011***	0.007**	0.006**
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Knows CC is real & caused by human	0.067***	0.023***	0.021***	0.008***
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Knows which gases cause CC	0.011***	0.010***	0.010***	0.010***
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Understands impacts of CC	0.003	0.004	−0.005	−0.006**
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Believes policies entail positive econ. effects	0.073***	0.022***	0.018***	0.018***
	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Believes policies would reduce pollution	0.118***	0.082***	0.051***	0.021***
	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Believes policies would reduce emissions	0.266***	0.084***	0.089***	0.122***
	(0.008)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Believes own household would lose	−0.338***	−0.087***	−0.120***	−0.116***
	(0.007)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Believes low-income earners will lose	−0.062***	−0.0004	−0.014***	−0.038***
	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Believes high-income earners will lose	0.015***	0.007***	0.006**	0.009***
	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Observations	40,680	40,680	40,680	40,680
R^2	0.698	0.389	0.357	0.378

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of variables listed in the columns on standardized variables measuring respondents' beliefs and perceptions. Country fixed effects, treatment indicators, and individual socioeconomic characteristics are included but not displayed. Dependent variables are indices (columns 1, 2), or indicator variables equal to 1 if the respondent (somewhat or strongly) supports each of the main climate policies (3, 4, 5). Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

Table A8: Correlation between *Support for main climate policies index* and beliefs in high-income countries

	Support for main climate policies index											
	AUS	CAN	DEU	DNK	ESP	FRA	GBR	ITA	JPN	KOR	POL	USA
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Control group mean	-0.206	-0.099	-0.095	-0.138	-0.1	-0.088	-0.11	-0.187	-0.101	-0.054	-0.048	0.03
Trusts the governement	−0.003	0.039**	0.032*	0.028	0.040***	0.066***	0.018	0.038**	0.020	0.067***	0.060***	0.025
	(0.018)	(0.015)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.014)	(0.020)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.015)	(0.016)
Believes inequality is an important problem	−0.001	0.035**	0.030**	0.090***	0.008	−0.006	0.031*	0.021	0.015	0.066***	0.024*	0.064***
	(0.021)	(0.016)	(0.015)	(0.019)	(0.014)	(0.020)	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.015)	(0.020)
Worries about the consequences of CC	0.071***	0.037**	0.035**	0.060***	0.010	0.026	0.065***	0.034*	0.025	0.022	0.044**	0.094***
	(0.022)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.016)	(0.023)	(0.021)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.021)	(0.018)	(0.021)
Believes net-zero is technically feasible	0.052***	0.022	0.009	0.041**	0.032**	−0.006	0.058***	0.0002	0.026	−0.008	−0.003	0.016
	(0.020)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.015)	(0.022)	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.021)	(0.020)	(0.016)	(0.020)
Believes will suffer from climate change	0.048*	0.046***	0.046***	0.060***	0.017	0.006	0.003	0.014	0.063***	0.080***	0.062***	0.061***
	(0.025)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.015)	(0.020)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.017)	(0.020)
Understands emission across activities/regions	−0.015	0.050***	0.016	0.016	0.019	0.018	0.014	0.025	0.026	−0.006	0.015	0.002
	(0.014)	(0.013)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.014)	(0.018)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.014)	(0.015)
Knows CC is real & caused by human	0.081***	0.087***	0.066***	0.040**	0.092***	0.094***	0.092***	0.078***	0.016	0.039*	0.067***	0.059***
	(0.020)	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.018)	(0.015)	(0.023)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.020)	(0.015)	(0.015)
Knows which gases cause CC	−0.003	0.012	0.013	0.012	0.012	0.020	0.008	0.026*	−0.005	0.012	0.010	−0.012
	(0.014)	(0.013)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.012)	(0.018)	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.013)	(0.014)
Understands impacts of CC	0.018	−0.003	−0.036**	−0.006	0.017	0.028	0.001	−0.012	0.021	−0.045**	−0.027*	−0.022
	(0.016)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.018)	(0.014)	(0.022)	(0.018)	(0.016)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.014)	(0.015)
Believes policies entail positive econ. effects	0.141***	0.131***	0.107***	0.087***	0.108***	0.054**	0.160***	0.117***	0.068***	0.076***	0.102***	0.070***
	(0.020)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.016)	(0.023)	(0.017)	(0.021)	(0.020)	(0.019)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Believes policies would reduce pollution	0.147***	0.121***	0.056**	0.147***	0.116***	0.125***	0.115***	0.197***	−0.015	0.149***	0.074***	0.049*
	(0.029)	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.030)	(0.028)	(0.037)	(0.027)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.033)	(0.028)	(0.029)
Believes policies would reduce emissions	0.144***	0.196***	0.261***	0.241***	0.265***	0.345***	0.233***	0.334***	0.485***	0.347***	0.311***	0.187***
	(0.034)	(0.029)	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.029)	(0.039)	(0.031)	(0.033)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.030)	(0.035)
Believes own household would lose	−0.329***	−0.388***	−0.373***	−0.294***	−0.341***	−0.248***	−0.344***	−0.211***	−0.300***	−0.279***	−0.374***	−0.342***
	(0.030)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.027)	(0.024)	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.025)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.023)	(0.030)
Believes low-income earners will lose	−0.085***	−0.061***	−0.119***	−0.102***	−0.077***	−0.120***	−0.046*	−0.016	−0.089***	−0.037	−0.070***	−0.147***
	(0.029)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.019)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.021)	(0.024)
Believes high-income earners will lose	−0.035**	0.020	0.012	−0.029	0.029**	0.038*	0.014	0.014	0.031	0.028	0.016	−0.017
	(0.017)	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.019)	(0.013)	(0.019)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.014)	(0.018)
Observations	1,978	2,022	2,006	2,013	2,268	2,006	2,025	2,088	1,990	1,932	2,053	2,218
R^2	0.773	0.766	0.726	0.660	0.707	0.619	0.743	0.646	0.620	0.619	0.696	0.764

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of the *Support for main policies index* on standardized variables measuring respondents' beliefs and perceptions. Treatment indicators and individual socioeconomic characteristics are included but not displayed. Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

Table A9: Correlation between *Support for main climate policies index* and beliefs in middle-income countries

	Support for main climate policies index							
	BRA	CHN	IDN	IND	MEX	TUR	UKR	ZAF
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Control group mean	-0.161	-0.117	-0.054	-0.059	-0.067	-0.041	-0.117	-0.113
Trusts the governement	−0.012	0.085***	0.085***	0.048**	0.052**	0.039	0.081***	0.062**
	(0.020)	(0.033)	(0.022)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.022)	(0.027)
Believes inequality is an important problem	0.064***	0.072***	0.066***	0.090***	0.060**	0.007	0.037	0.026
	(0.023)	(0.026)	(0.018)	(0.028)	(0.024)	(0.028)	(0.023)	(0.021)
Worries about the consequences of CC	0.044*	0.099***	0.043**	−0.022	0.044*	0.057**	0.018	0.058**
	(0.023)	(0.027)	(0.019)	(0.028)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.023)
Believes net-zero is technically feasible	0.017	0.013	0.034	0.021	0.013	0.047**	0.035	0.017
	(0.021)	(0.031)	(0.023)	(0.029)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.025)
Believes will suffer from climate change	0.050**	0.004	0.046***	0.045	0.078***	0.082***	0.072***	0.015
	(0.023)	(0.027)	(0.017)	(0.029)	(0.025)	(0.029)	(0.024)	(0.023)
Understands emission across activities/regions	0.044**	0.009	0.008	0.004	0.027	−0.015	−0.011	−0.011
	(0.020)	(0.023)	(0.013)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.021)	(0.019)	(0.020)
Knows CC is real & caused by human	0.026	−0.016	0.033**	0.086***	0.062***	0.067**	0.063***	0.053**
	(0.022)	(0.024)	(0.016)	(0.019)	(0.024)	(0.028)	(0.020)	(0.022)
Knows which gases cause CC	0.018	−0.029	−0.002	0.019	0.044**	0.043**	−0.012	0.050**
	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.014)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.022)
Understands impacts of CC	0.024	0.019	0.015	0.069***	−0.006	0.013	0.027	0.021
	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.014)	(0.024)	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)
Believes policies entail positive econ. effects	0.052**	0.013	0.015	−0.014	0.070***	0.008	0.116***	0.079***
	(0.021)	(0.023)	(0.011)	(0.019)	(0.022)	(0.019)	(0.023)	(0.025)
Believes policies would reduce pollution	0.161***	−0.052	0.092***	0.178***	0.107***	0.230***	0.155***	0.122***
	(0.030)	(0.035)	(0.023)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.046)	(0.037)	(0.038)
Believes policies would reduce emissions	0.293***	0.289***	0.301***	0.270***	0.256***	0.237***	0.244***	0.279***
	(0.033)	(0.042)	(0.033)	(0.043)	(0.038)	(0.051)	(0.041)	(0.038)
Believes own household would lose	−0.307***	−0.332***	−0.351***	−0.377***	−0.365***	−0.270***	−0.349***	−0.366***
	(0.038)	(0.040)	(0.038)	(0.044)	(0.033)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.034)
Believes low-income earners will lose	−0.035	−0.113***	−0.037	0.074*	−0.051*	−0.123***	−0.020	−0.015
	(0.029)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.040)	(0.027)	(0.031)	(0.028)	(0.034)
Believes high-income earners will lose	−0.002	−0.043	0.023	0.069***	0.043**	0.036*	0.036*	−0.025
	(0.020)	(0.028)	(0.018)	(0.025)	(0.021)	(0.019)	(0.021)	(0.021)
Observations	1,860	1,717	2,488	2,472	2,045	1,932	1,564	2,003
R^2	0.650	0.574	0.716	0.607	0.618	0.668	0.642	0.577

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of the *Support for main policies index* on standardized variables measuring respondents' beliefs and perceptions. Treatment indicators and individual socioeconomic characteristics are included but not displayed. Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

Table A10: Effects of the treatments on support for climate action

	Support or Agreement				
	Green infrastructure program	Ban on combustion-engine cars	Carbon tax with cash transfers	Fairness of main climate policies index	Adopt climate-friendly behaviors
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Control group mean	0.656	0.517	0.46	-0.08	-0.034
Treatment: Climate impacts	0.020***	0.018**	0.028***	0.042***	0.053***
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.016)	(0.017)
Treatment: Climate policy	0.025***	0.043***	0.097***	0.128***	0.020
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.016)	(0.017)
Treatment: Both	0.048***	0.072***	0.128***	0.188***	0.080***
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.016)	(0.016)
Observations	40,680	40,680	40,680	40,680	40,680
R^2	0.101	0.093	0.104	0.145	0.101

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of variables listed in the columns on socioeconomic characteristics, controlling for country fixed effects. Only the coefficients for the treatment effects are displayed. Dependent variables are indicator variables equal to 1 if the respondent (somewhat or strongly) supports each of the main climate policies (columns 1, 2, 3), or indices (4, 5). Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

Table A11: Effects of the treatments on main outcomes – High-income countries

		Support or Agreement										
		Ban on combustion-engine cars	Green infrastructure program	Carbon tax with cash transfers	Main policies are fair	Willing to adopt climate-friendly behaviors	Ban on combustion-engine cars with alternatives	Tax on fossil fuels	Ban on polluting cars in city centers	Tax on flights	Subsidies to low-carbon technologies	Mandatory and subsidized insulation
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Australia	Control group mean	0.354	0.493	0.343	-0.186	-0.112	0.383	0.357	0.526	0.353	0.617	0.698
	Treatment: Climate impacts	0.105***	0.087**	0.108***	0.202***	0.157**	0.108***	0.031	0.064*	−0.005	0.072**	0.010
		(0.037)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.078)	(0.075)	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.036)	(0.048)
	Treatment: Climate policy	0.068*	0.084**	0.144***	0.246***	0.197***	0.063*	0.053	0.054	0.015	0.010	−0.010
		(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.075)	(0.073)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.036)	(0.048)
	Treatment: Both	0.153***	0.109***	0.169***	0.283***	0.096	0.149***	0.127***	0.080**	0.068*	0.037	0.019
		(0.037)	(0.038)	(0.037)	(0.081)	(0.076)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.037)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.049)
Canada	Control group mean	0.474	0.562	0.414	-0.091	-0.008	0.471	0.399	0.604	0.443	0.646	0.643
	Treatment: Climate impacts	−0.023	−0.009	0.019	−0.014	−0.026	−0.011	−0.029	−0.004	0.008	−0.017	0.087**
		(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.069)	(0.070)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.043)
	Treatment: Climate policy	0.016	0.091***	0.117***	0.221***	0.040	0.045	0.060*	0.024	0.048	0.045	0.079*
		(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.067)	(0.069)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.032)	(0.045)
	Treatment: Both	0.020	0.075**	0.105***	0.196***	0.048	0.046	0.054	0.007	0.061*	0.032	0.112***
		(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.066)	(0.071)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.033)	(0.043)
Denmark	Control group mean	0.405	0.534	0.296	-0.154	0.041	0.42	0.431	0.661	0.6	0.672	0.698
	Treatment: Climate impacts	0.074**	0.052	0.070**	0.177***	0.005	0.085**	0.004	0.007	−0.037	−0.020	0.024
		(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.035)	(0.068)	(0.068)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.034)	(0.036)	(0.035)	(0.045)
	Treatment: Climate policy	0.055	−0.016	0.101***	0.163**	−0.140**	0.025	−0.007	−0.099***	−0.078**	−0.017	−0.073
		(0.035)	(0.036)	(0.033)	(0.069)	(0.071)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.048)
	Treatment: Both	0.112***	0.080**	0.192***	0.281***	−0.073	0.076**	0.101***	0.00003	−0.033	0.051	0.010
		(0.035)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.074)	(0.074)	(0.037)	(0.036)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.048)
France	Control group mean	0.278	0.571	0.289	-0.05	-0.045	0.425	0.309	0.568	0.455	0.563	0.641
	Treatment: Climate impacts	0.038	0.059	0.061*	−0.003	0.082	−0.012	0.005	0.035	0.069*	0.054	0.046
		(0.034)	(0.038)	(0.035)	(0.071)	(0.075)	(0.038)	(0.035)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.051)
	Treatment: Climate policy	0.079**	0.036	0.084**	0.030	−0.031	0.034	−0.002	−0.018	0.004	0.019	−0.050
		(0.036)	(0.037)	(0.036)	(0.075)	(0.071)	(0.038)	(0.035)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.052)
	Treatment: Both	0.118***	0.062	0.152***	0.131	0.121	0.020	0.064*	0.036	0.004	0.097**	−0.006
		(0.037)	(0.039)	(0.038)	(0.081)	(0.082)	(0.039)	(0.037)	(0.039)	(0.040)	(0.038)	(0.055)
Germany	Control group mean	0.318	0.42	0.279	-0.093	-0.037	0.413	0.311	0.495	0.528	0.636	0.596
	Treatment: Climate impacts	0.003	0.033	0.039	0.050	0.068	−0.007	0.050	0.035	0.003	0.009	−0.003
		(0.032)	(0.034)	(0.031)	(0.070)	(0.070)	(0.034)	(0.032)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.033)	(0.049)
	Treatment: Climate policy	0.026	0.026	0.138***	0.147**	0.016	0.054	0.079**	−0.019	0.027	−0.026	−0.025
		(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.074)	(0.074)	(0.036)	(0.034)	(0.036)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.050)
	Treatment: Both	0.011	0.025	0.092***	0.195***	0.082	0.048	0.067**	0.049	0.052	−0.036	0.040
		(0.033)	(0.035)	(0.033)	(0.069)	(0.067)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.051)
Italy	Control group mean	0.541	0.781	0.47	-0.181	-0.026	0.577	0.381	0.758	0.414	0.788	0.726
	Treatment: Climate impacts	0.030	0.021	0.043	0.099	0.004	0.032	0.017	−0.027	0.034	−0.010	0.012
		(0.033)	(0.026)	(0.033)	(0.067)	(0.068)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.029)	(0.032)	(0.027)	(0.040)
	Treatment: Climate policy	0.080**	0.035	0.154***	0.291***	−0.010	0.073**	0.087***	0.032	0.047	0.014	0.013
		(0.032)	(0.026)	(0.032)	(0.062)	(0.064)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.028)	(0.033)	(0.027)	(0.040)
	Treatment: Both	0.120***	0.039	0.189***	0.359***	0.094	0.096***	0.130***	0.003	0.089***	0.012	0.048
		(0.032)	(0.026)	(0.032)	(0.065)	(0.064)	(0.032)	(0.031)	(0.028)	(0.032)	(0.026)	(0.039)
Japan	Control group mean	0.407	0.475	0.351	-0.121	-0.081	0.512	0.353	0.645	0.468	0.691	0.588
	Treatment: Climate impacts	0.007	0.032	0.009	0.079	0.156**	−0.011	0.006	−0.035	0.019	−0.037	0.003
		(0.035)	(0.036)	(0.035)	(0.070)	(0.071)	(0.036)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.036)	(0.034)	(0.049)
	Treatment: Climate policy	0.067*	0.054	0.094***	0.168**	0.042	0.082**	0.081**	0.007	−0.002	−0.015	−0.019
		(0.036)	(0.037)	(0.036)	(0.072)	(0.073)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.035)	(0.037)	(0.035)	(0.051)
	Treatment: Both	0.074**	0.046	0.124***	0.220***	0.153**	0.032	0.043	−0.010	0.030	−0.053	−0.076
		(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.072)	(0.070)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.036)	(0.034)	(0.049)
Poland	Control group mean	0.439	0.58	0.356	-0.038	-0.061	0.478	0.275	0.609	0.44	0.75	0.724
	Treatment: Climate impacts	0.032	0.035	0.045	0.040	0.121**	0.068**	0.024	0.020	0.027	0.011	−0.023
		(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.031)	(0.062)	(0.061)	(0.032)	(0.029)	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.028)	(0.043)
	Treatment: Climate policy	0.032	0.040	0.086***	0.073	0.097	0.041	0.114***	0.033	0.055*	−0.046	0.005
		(0.032)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.064)	(0.065)	(0.032)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.029)	(0.041)
	Treatment: Both	0.034	0.025	0.084***	0.095	0.113*	0.024	0.123***	0.002	0.072**	−0.036	−0.028
		(0.033)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.066)	(0.064)	(0.032)	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.029)	(0.044)
South Korea	Control group mean	0.517	0.685	0.526	-0.084	0.015	0.585	0.421	0.52	0.42	0.709	0.716
	Treatment: Climate impacts	−0.035	−0.024	−0.015	0.028	0.054	−0.019	−0.007	0.009	0.027	−0.016	0.004
		(0.037)	(0.035)	(0.038)	(0.072)	(0.078)	(0.038)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.038)	(0.035)	(0.048)
	Treatment: Climate policy	−0.025	−0.006	0.069*	0.107	−0.096	0.023	0.028	−0.029	0.067*	0.014	−0.010
		(0.038)	(0.034)	(0.037)	(0.078)	(0.076)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.038)	(0.034)	(0.049)
	Treatment: Both	0.047	0.009	0.130***	0.248***	0.031	0.025	0.096***	0.022	0.104***	−0.006	−0.032
		(0.036)	(0.034)	(0.036)	(0.073)	(0.072)	(0.036)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.034)	(0.046)
Spain	Control group mean	0.542	0.706	0.438	-0.062	-0.048	0.568	0.394	0.639	0.442	0.735	0.711
	Treatment: Climate impacts	0.009	0.004	0.012	−0.025	0.057	0.027	0.006	−0.007	0.040	0.020	0.014
		(0.031)	(0.028)	(0.031)	(0.061)	(0.061)	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.027)	(0.050)
	Treatment: Climate policy	0.025	0.017	0.091***	0.056	−0.004	0.050	0.058*	−0.003	0.048	0.025	0.058
		(0.031)	(0.028)	(0.031)	(0.062)	(0.063)	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.027)	(0.047)
	Treatment: Both	0.084***	0.078***	0.132***	0.218***	0.127**	0.084***	0.112***	0.074***	0.075**	0.032	0.063
		(0.030)	(0.026)	(0.030)	(0.059)	(0.059)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.026)	(0.046)
U.K.	Control group mean	0.451	0.544	0.339	-0.1	-0.066	0.52	0.376	0.646	0.456	0.652	0.702
	Treatment: Climate impacts	0.005	0.029	0.022	0.039	0.039	−0.018	0.046	−0.029	0.031	−0.001	−0.040
		(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.032)	(0.067)	(0.070)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.033)	(0.048)
	Treatment: Climate policy	0.037	0.018	0.104***	0.110	0.064	0.001	0.071**	−0.018	0.026	−0.057*	−0.089*
		(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.033)	(0.069)	(0.070)	(0.035)	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.048)
	Treatment: Both	0.091***	0.083**	0.189***	0.308***	0.173**	0.033	0.133***	0.030	0.088**	−0.006	−0.078
		(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.069)	(0.069)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.033)	(0.035)	(0.033)	(0.048)
U.S.	Control group mean	0.388	0.5	0.328	0.026	0.019	0.435	0.338	0.486	0.329	0.565	0.528
	Treatment: Climate impacts	0.002	−0.070*	−0.001	−0.084	−0.055	−0.068**	−0.040	−0.030	−0.034	−0.021	−0.015
		(0.035)	(0.036)	(0.034)	(0.068)	(0.072)	(0.033)	(0.032)	(0.036)	(0.032)	(0.035)	(0.050)
	Treatment: Climate policy	0.038	−0.020	0.077**	−0.019	−0.002	−0.029	0.038	0.044	0.063*	−0.034	−0.033
		(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.071)	(0.072)	(0.034)	(0.032)	(0.035)	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.050)
	Treatment: Both	0.047	0.034	0.099***	0.048	0.014	0.018	0.025	0.095**	0.045	0.006	0.065
		(0.036)	(0.038)	(0.037)	(0.071)	(0.071)	(0.036)	(0.033)	(0.037)	(0.034)	(0.036)	(0.053)

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of variables listed in the columns on socioeconomic characteristics. Only the coefficients for the treatment effects are displayed. Dependent variables are indicator variables equal to 1 if the respondent (somewhat or strongly) supports each of the main climate policies (columns 1-3 and 6-11), or standardized indices (4-5). Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

Table A12: Effects of the treatments on main outcomes – Middle-income countries

		Support or Agreement										
		Ban on combustion-engine cars	Green infrastructure program	Carbon tax with cash transfers	Main policies are fair	Willing to adopt climate-friendly behaviors	Ban on combustion-engine cars with alternatives	Tax on fossil fuels	Ban on polluting cars in city centers	Tax on flights	Subsidies to low-carbon technologies	Mandatory and subsidized insulation
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Brazil	Control group mean	0.604	0.766	0.473	-0.136	-0.055	0.597	0.346	0.649	0.387	0.772	
	Treatment: Climate impacts	0.039	0.034	0.056	0.100	0.077	0.087**	0.096**	0.024	0.105**	0.026	
		(0.041)	(0.034)	(0.042)	(0.085)	(0.087)	(0.040)	(0.041)	(0.040)	(0.042)	(0.035)	
	Treatment: Climate policy	0.046	0.012	0.121***	0.199**	0.045	0.077*	0.086**	0.088**	0.098**	0.066*	
		(0.043)	(0.037)	(0.043)	(0.085)	(0.090)	(0.042)	(0.042)	(0.040)	(0.043)	(0.034)	
	Treatment: Both	0.096**	0.039	0.226***	0.261***	0.086	0.092**	0.166***	0.078*	0.142***	0.049	
		(0.042)	(0.036)	(0.041)	(0.086)	(0.084)	(0.040)	(0.042)	(0.041)	(0.043)	(0.036)	
China	Control group mean	0.72	0.815	0.801	-0.138	-0.009	0.782	0.584	0.73	0.608	0.745	0.797
	Treatment: Climate impacts	0.054	0.051	0.073**	0.122	−0.013	0.022	0.077*	0.052	0.045	0.019	0.029
		(0.041)	(0.034)	(0.033)	(0.091)	(0.098)	(0.039)	(0.046)	(0.041)	(0.046)	(0.043)	(0.056)
	Treatment: Climate policy	0.035	0.010	0.081**	0.151*	0.060	0.036	0.069	0.051	0.104**	0.039	0.068
		(0.042)	(0.037)	(0.034)	(0.091)	(0.098)	(0.038)	(0.046)	(0.040)	(0.044)	(0.041)	(0.048)
	Treatment: Both	0.087**	0.067*	0.046	0.262***	−0.025	0.027	0.042	0.092**	−0.022	0.053	0.081*
		(0.040)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.092)	(0.093)	(0.039)	(0.046)	(0.039)	(0.045)	(0.041)	(0.046)
India	Control group mean	0.775	0.8	0.709	-0.008	0.012	0.77	0.637	0.735	0.635	0.675	
	Treatment: Climate impacts	−0.033	0.025	0.011	−0.071	−0.056	0.009	−0.029	0.003	−0.024	0.024	
		(0.034)	(0.030)	(0.034)	(0.074)	(0.075)	(0.033)	(0.037)	(0.036)	(0.037)	(0.038)	
	Treatment: Climate policy	0.034	0.036	0.073**	0.071	−0.045	0.027	0.015	0.037	−0.002	0.072*	
		(0.032)	(0.029)	(0.034)	(0.076)	(0.076)	(0.033)	(0.038)	(0.034)	(0.038)	(0.037)	
	Treatment: Both	0.018	0.030	0.060*	0.009	0.063	0.032	0.059	0.059*	0.049	0.102***	
		(0.033)	(0.030)	(0.033)	(0.082)	(0.074)	(0.032)	(0.038)	(0.033)	(0.037)	(0.036)	
Indonesia	Control group mean	0.655	0.803	0.671	-0.09	-0.02	0.725	0.583	0.852	0.676	0.792	
	Treatment: Climate impacts	0.029	0.012	0.0004	0.078	0.068	0.034	0.027	0.008	0.010	−0.002	
		(0.026)	(0.023)	(0.026)	(0.053)	(0.050)	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.021)	(0.026)	(0.024)	
	Treatment: Climate policy	0.044*	0.016	0.071***	0.147***	−0.001	0.012	0.083***	0.002	0.023	0.026	
		(0.027)	(0.024)	(0.027)	(0.055)	(0.052)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.022)	(0.027)	(0.024)	
	Treatment: Both	0.047*	0.062***	0.093***	0.204***	0.081*	0.060**	0.079***	0.020	0.023	0.045**	
		(0.026)	(0.022)	(0.025)	(0.051)	(0.049)	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.021)	(0.026)	(0.023)	
Mexico	Control group mean	0.666	0.836	0.552	-0.07	-0.081	0.66	0.407	0.724	0.509	0.663	
	Treatment: Climate impacts	0.010	0.002	0.033	0.113	0.173**	0.059	0.008	0.032	0.007	0.089**	
		(0.040)	(0.032)	(0.041)	(0.081)	(0.087)	(0.039)	(0.041)	(0.037)	(0.042)	(0.037)	
	Treatment: Climate policy	0.034	0.024	0.064	0.066	0.097	0.053	0.060	0.005	0.046	0.104***	
		(0.040)	(0.031)	(0.042)	(0.088)	(0.086)	(0.040)	(0.042)	(0.038)	(0.043)	(0.037)	
	Treatment: Both	0.077*	0.008	0.150***	0.133	0.114	0.034	0.125***	0.031	0.034	0.107***	
		(0.040)	(0.032)	(0.041)	(0.083)	(0.092)	(0.041)	(0.043)	(0.039)	(0.043)	(0.039)	
South Africa	Control group mean	0.527	0.726	0.523	-0.112	-0.09	0.619	0.379	0.66	0.428	0.747	0.726
	Treatment: Climate impacts	0.025	0.049	0.043	0.037	0.171**	−0.003	0.028	−0.012	0.044	−0.006	0.076
		(0.041)	(0.035)	(0.040)	(0.082)	(0.083)	(0.041)	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.041)	(0.036)	(0.050)
	Treatment: Climate policy	0.106***	0.021	0.084**	0.230***	0.091	0.111***	0.128***	0.069*	0.125***	0.025	0.130***
		(0.040)	(0.037)	(0.040)	(0.080)	(0.084)	(0.038)	(0.039)	(0.037)	(0.040)	(0.034)	(0.044)
	Treatment: Both	0.133***	0.070*	0.104**	0.262***	0.151*	0.085**	0.154***	0.058	0.078*	0.080**	0.025
		(0.041)	(0.036)	(0.041)	(0.083)	(0.086)	(0.040)	(0.041)	(0.039)	(0.042)	(0.033)	(0.053)
Turkey	Control group mean	0.618	0.759	0.554	-0.081	-0.074	0.637	0.516	0.601	0.454	0.747	0.745
	Treatment: Climate impacts	0.004	−0.007	−0.074*	−0.064	−0.017	−0.047	−0.004	−0.022	−0.039	−0.023	0.025
		(0.042)	(0.038)	(0.043)	(0.089)	(0.089)	(0.043)	(0.044)	(0.043)	(0.042)	(0.040)	(0.058)
	Treatment: Climate policy	0.059	−0.001	0.109**	0.256***	0.155*	0.046	0.139***	0.112***	0.155***	0.065*	0.123**
		(0.042)	(0.040)	(0.044)	(0.085)	(0.084)	(0.042)	(0.043)	(0.042)	(0.044)	(0.038)	(0.051)
	Treatment: Both	0.075*	0.021	0.073	0.136*	0.142*	0.047	0.019	−0.021	0.030	−0.056	0.028
		(0.042)	(0.039)	(0.044)	(0.082)	(0.084)	(0.041)	(0.045)	(0.044)	(0.044)	(0.042)	(0.059)
Ukraine	Control group mean	0.575	0.688	0.393	-0.15	-0.077	0.631	0.275	0.671	0.358	0.684	0.754
	Treatment: Climate impacts	0.014	0.003	0.035	0.058	0.079	0.002	0.059	−0.060	0.012	−0.014	0.052
		(0.045)	(0.042)	(0.044)	(0.086)	(0.087)	(0.043)	(0.042)	(0.040)	(0.044)	(0.041)	(0.053)
	Treatment: Climate policy	0.048	0.063	0.179***	0.234***	0.058	−0.001	0.181***	0.039	0.134***	0.003	0.045
		(0.046)	(0.041)	(0.046)	(0.087)	(0.093)	(0.046)	(0.044)	(0.041)	(0.046)	(0.043)	(0.056)
	Treatment: Both	0.032	0.046	0.201***	0.269***	0.132	0.023	0.165***	0.068*	0.075*	0.039	0.010
		(0.045)	(0.040)	(0.043)	(0.090)	(0.096)	(0.044)	(0.042)	(0.038)	(0.044)	(0.041)	(0.058)

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of variables listed in the columns on socioeconomic characteristics. Only the coefficients for the treatment effects are displayed. Dependent variables are indicator variables equal to 1 if the respondent (somewhat or strongly) supports each of the main climate policies (columns 1-3 and 6-11), or standardized indices (4-5). Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

Table A13: Effects of the treatments on expectations about the future

	Agreement				
	Net-zero by 2100 is feasible	Unabated CC will negatively affect oneself	Unabated CC will cause extinction of humanity	World will be richer in 2100	Humans will halt CC by 2100
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Control group mean	0.364	0.473	0.64	0.276	0.481
Treatment: Climate impacts	0.049***	0.038***	0.027***	−0.004	0.026***
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.008)
Treatment: Climate policy	0.022***	0.018**	0.018**	0.015**	0.052***
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.008)
Treatment: Both	0.061***	0.031***	0.035***	0.015**	0.072***
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.008)
Observations	40,680	40,680	40,680	40,680	40,680
R^2	0.082	0.121	0.061	0.170	0.109

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of variables listed in the columns on socioeconomic characteristics. Only the coefficients for the treatment effects are displayed. Dependent variables are indicator variables equal to 1 if the respondent (somewhat or strongly) agree with the statements. Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

A-5 Questionnaire

Survey links

Here are links to the questionnaires of each country:

- Australia: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_0HrxQpnzN85dR2K?Q_Language=EN-GB
- Brazil: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_bjhZJbHPlU82OtE?Q_Language=PT-BR
- Canada (English): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_9FveryHcJFsYfoq?Q_Language=EN
- Canada (French): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_9FveryHcJFsYfoq?Q_Language=FR-CA
- China: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_3ad13wqkW9bBvfw?Q_Language=ZN
- Denmark: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_1MiPDLoaLlxf9X0?Q_Language=DA
- France: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8CfmrUXhHRZJT14?Q_Language=FR
- Germany: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_0cWAJE2W8bdBPkG?Q_Language=DE
- India (English): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_07HaTFCaGAklSrI?Q_Language=EN
- India (Hindi): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_07HaTFCaGAklSrI?Q_Language=HI
- Indonesia: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_3mV8QUArjqZOhtc?Q_Language=ID
- Italy: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_bpiASf7NzB8u0wS?Q_Language=IT
- Japan: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_6FE48OtnfRWabRQ?Q_Language=JA
- Mexico: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8csgJ7Uuymp7irY?Q_Language=ES

- Poland: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_7Qc5KCPcIVv5qFE?Q_Language=PL
- South Africa (English): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_bvC37FRXIyGewKi?Q_Language=EN-US
- South Africa (Zulu): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_bvC37FRXIyGewKi?Q_Language=ZU
- South Korea: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_bwNjSPYjPojkuk6?Q_Language=KO
- Spain: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_0d0TZD6KT4L2SOi?Q_Language=ES-ES
- Turkey: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_3krmyMYslsDFBI2?Q_Language=TR
- Ukraine (Ukrainian): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_3gdsY6iHVO6IKNg?Q_Language=UK
- Ukraine (Russian): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_3gdsY6iHVO6IKNg?Q_Language=RU
- United Kingdom: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_40Dm4ZTOR8mlzaS?Q_Language=EN-GB
- United States: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_1ST7y8mzlEib9iu

Below is the benchmark questionnaire, with country-specific variations indicated in square brackets.

Consent

1. This is a survey conducted for academic research purposes by researchers from Harvard University and the OECD. It will take approximately 25 minutes to complete. The survey data is used for research purposes only, and the research is non-partisan. You will be compensated for this survey if you complete the survey and your responses pass our survey quality checks. These checks use statistical control methods to detect incoherent and rushed responses. It is very important for the validity of our research that you answer honestly and read the questions carefully before answering.

   The survey collects personal data, including socioeconomic characteristics and political views. All of the answers you provide will remain anonymous and be treated with absolute confidentiality. The personal data we collect will be transferred and stored on secure servers. Only researchers working on the project will have access to the

anonymized data. Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary. You are entitled to choose not to take part. If at first you agree to take part, you can later change your mind. Your decision will not be held against you in any way. Your refusal to participate will not result in any consequences or any loss of benefits that you are otherwise entitled to receive. You can ask any questions before you decide whether to participate.

If you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or think the research has offended you, you can contact the research team at social.economics.research2020@gmail.com or call the Harvard University Area Institutional Review Board ("IRB") at +1 (617) 496-2847. The OECD is committed to protecting the personal data it processes, in accordance with its Personal Data Protection Rules (https://www.oecd.org/general/data-protection.htm). If you have further queries or complaints related to the processing of your personal data, please contact the Data Protection Officer (DPO@oecd.org). If you need further assistance in resolving claims related to personal data protection you can contact the Data Protection Commissioner (DPC@oecd.org).

Do you agree to participate in the survey?
Yes; No

Background questions

2. What is your gender?
   Male; Female; Other

3. How old are you?
   Below 18; 18 to 24; 25 to 34; 35 to 49; 50 to 64; 65 and above

4. What is your zipcode?

5. What type of agglomeration do you live in?
   A rural area; A small town (5,000 - 20,000 inhabitants); A large town (20,000 - 50,000 inhabitants); A small city or its suburbs (50,000 - 250,000 inhabitants); A large city or its suburbs (250,000 - 3,000,000 inhabitants); A very large city or its suburbs (more than 3 million inhabitants)

6. What is the nationality of your parents? (Multiple answers allowed) [For the U.S. and South Africa, we asked the ethnicity instead; and for India, the religion.]
   [Country]; [Continent except Country]; Other; Prefer not to say

7. Do you live with your partner (if you have one)?
   Yes; No or I don't have a partner

8. What is your marital status?
   Single; Married; Divorced or legally separated; Widowed

9. How many people are in your household? The household includes: you, the members of your family who live with you (including children), and your dependants. This excludes flatmates.
   1; 2; 3; 4; 5 or more

10. How many children below 14 live with you?
    0; 1; 2; 3; 4 or more

11. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
    No schooling completed; Primary school; Lower secondary school; Vocational degree; High school; College degree; Master's degree or above

12. What is your employment status?
    Full-time employed; Part-time employed; Self-employed; Student; Retired; Unemployed (searching for a job); Inactive (not searching for a job)

13. (If "Full-time employed", "Part-time employed", or "Self-employed" to 12) If you work in any of the following industries, please select one describing your industry best.
    Oil, gas or coal; Other energy industries; Cement production; Construction; Automobile manufacturing; Iron and steel manufacturing; Chemical manufacturing; Plastics production; Pulp and paper production; Farming (crop or livestock); Air transport (e.g. airlines); No, none of the above

14. (If "Retired", "Unemployed (searching for a job)", "Inactive (not searching for a job)" to 12) If in your last job you worked in any of the following industries, please select one describing your industry best
    Oil, gas or coal; Other energy industries; Cement production; Construction; Automobile manufacturing; Iron and steel manufacturing; Chemical manufacturing; Plastics production; Pulp and paper production; Farming (crop or livestock); Air transport (e.g. airlines); No, none of the above

15. (If "Full-time employed", "Part-time employed", or "Self-employed" to 12) What is the main activity of the company or organization where you work?
    Agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting; Mining, quarrying, oil, gas, extraction; Utilities; Construction; Manufacturing; Wholesale trade; Retail trade; Transportation and warehousing; Information technology (IT); Finance and insurance; Real estate and rental and leasing; Professional, scientific and technical; Management of companies and enterprises; Administrative and support activities; Waste management and remediation; Educational services; Healthcare and social assistance; Arts, entertainment and recreation; Accommodation and food services; Other services; Public administration; Homemaker; None of the above / Other

16. (If "Retired", "Unemployed (searching for a job)", "Inactive (not searching for a job)" to 12) What was the main activity of the company or organization at which you last worked?

Agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting; Mining, quarrying, oil, gas, extraction; Utilities; Construction; Manufacturing; Wholesale trade; Retail trade; Transportation and warehousing; Information technology (IT); Finance and insurance; Real estate and rental and leasing; Professional, scientific and technical; Management of companies and enterprises; Administrative and support activities; Waste management and remediation; Educational services; Healthcare and social assistance; Arts, entertainment and recreation; Accommodation and food services; Other services; Public administration; Homemaker; None of the above / Other

17. What was the annual income of your household in 2019 (before withholding tax)? [Depending on the country, we ask this question in monthly or yearly terms. Except in the U.S., we adjust the quartile thresholds by multiplying them by the number of consumption units in the households.]
[quartiles thresholds are given for the U.S.] *Less than [$35,000] ; between [$35,000] - [$70,000]; between [$70,000] - [$120,000]; More than [$120,000]*

18. Have you or a member of your household been laid off or had to take a cut in your salary or wages due to the COVID-19 pandemic?
Yes; No

19. Are you a homeowner or a tenant? (Multiple answers are possible)
Tenant; Owner; Landlord renting out property

20. What is the estimated value of your assets, or the assets of your household if you are married (in [currency])? Include here all your possessions (home, car, savings, etc.) net of debt. For example, if you own a house worth [$300,000] and you have [$100,000] left to repay on your mortgage, your assets are [$200,000]. I estimate my assets net of debt to be:
[Quintiles thresholds are given for the U.S.] *Less than [$0]; Between [$0] - [$4,000]; Between [$4,000] - [$120,000]; Between [$120,000] - [$380,000]; More than [$380,000]*

Political views

21. To what extent are you interested in politics?
Not at all; A little; Moderately; A lot; A great deal

22. Are you a member of an environmental organization?
Yes; No

23. Do you have any relatives who are environmentalists?
Yes; No

24. (In China, the next three questions were not asked, and the other questions from this block were asked at the end of the survey.) Did you vote in the [last] election?
Yes; No: I don't have the right to vote in [Country]; Prefer not to say

25. (If "Yes" to 24) Which candidate did you vote for in the [last] election?
[Main candidates or parties]; Other; Prefer not to say

26. (If not "Yes" to 24) Even if you did NOT vote in the [last] election, please indicate the candidate that you were most likely to have voted for or who represents your views more closely.
[Main candidates or parties]; Other; Prefer not to say

27. On economic policy matters, where do you see yourself on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is Left and 5 is Right? [in the U.S., Denmark and France, the formulation was different: "On economic policy matters, where do you see yourself on the liberal/conservative spectrum?" and the answers were *Very liberal; Liberal; Moderate; Conservative; Very conservative; Prefer not to say*]
1; 2; 3; 4; 5

28. [In the U.S. only] What do you consider to be your political affiliation, as of today?
Republican; Democrat; Independent; Other; Non-Affiliated

Household composition and energy characteristics

(In Brazil, Mexico, India, and Indonesia, the next two questions on heating were not asked.)

29. What is the main way you heat your home? Electricity; Gas; Heating oil; Coal; Wood, solar, geothermal, or heat pump; District heating; Don't know, or prefer not to say

30. In a typical month [or year, depending on countries], how much do you spend on heating for your accommodation?
[Numbers are given for the U.S.] *I don't know; Less than [$20]; [$20]-[$75]; [$75]-[$125]; [$125]-[$200]; [$200]-[$250]; [$250]-[$300]; More than [$300]*

31. Good insulation can keep a building warm in the winter and cool in the summer. How do you rate the insulation of your accommodation?
Very poor; Poor; Fair; Good; Excellent

32. In a typical month, how much do you spend on gas for driving?
[Numbers are given for the U.S.] *Less than [$5]; [$5]-[$25]; [$25]-[$75]; [$75]-[$125]; [$125]-[$175]; [$175]-[$225]; More than [$225]*

33. How many round-trip flights did you take between 2017 and 2019?
0; 1; 2; 3 or 4; 5 to 7; 8 to 14; 15 or more

34. How often do you eat [beef / India: meat]?
Never; Less than once a week; One to four times per week; Almost or at least daily

35. Which mode of transport did you mainly use for each of the following trips in 2019?

- Commute to work or place of study
- Grocery shopping
- Recreational and leisure activities (excluding holiday travel)

Car or Motorbike; Public Transport; Walking or Cycling; Other; Not Applicable

36. How do you rate the availability (ease of access and frequency) of public transportation where you live?
Very poor; Poor; Fair; Good; Excellent

Open-ended question

37. When thinking about climate change, what are your main considerations? What should [country] government do regarding climate change? Please write as much as you would like, your response will be very useful.

Video treatments

Randomized groups of respondents see one of two videos, both videos, or neither.

Climate impacts video

Recent academic studies have assessed the effects of climate change in [country]. We will now show you a 3 minute video (with sound) that summarizes the results of these studies. Please pay attention to the information provided as you will be asked questions about it later. Do not skip forward or close the page while the video is running. Please proceed to the next page when you are ready.
[Here are the links to the video of each country:]

- Australia: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_6zC4wlmsEXrDnYq
- Brazil: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_57lND3lSz5SL4oK
- Canada (English): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_9zxyasw9TTVFqx8
- Canada (French): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_1QSWUKIYiJDNxfE
- China: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_9vHesDcevMYMffU
- Denmark: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_dgnXQoN84vq2YXs

- France: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_9YacInO3B7TVcGy
- Germany: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_3NNS6u7MbEm738y
- India (English): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_b9lU7goEX1i0FvM
- India (Hindi): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_bvLcTKdd7WG8SZ8
- Indonesia: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_9QQCwEicwdwYp94
- Italy: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_1GpaU9AOp0uA246
- Japan: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_e3BFKqjnqsS0waW
- Mexico: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_cSdiidvle1QaekS
- Poland: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_6SahJCEqAUd5bdc
- South Africa (English): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_8iAWsyQlvy07iJg
- South Africa (Zulu): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_4NHM2UHj6XttP70
- South Korea: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_2071FHigxMNs2rk
- Spain: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_4NsVOyDmpposo3I
- Turkey: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_8AKIwJiwMxyQnyu
- Ukraine (Ukrainian): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_1Bz6VaDS6IzAMGq
- Ukraine (Russian): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_bemd3trrg7wgFym

- United Kingdom: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_bj8yT5eiDpZCR82
- United States: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_cT8837yWYLScqLs

[Below is the script used for the U.S.]
Over the past decades, humans have been burning more and more fossil fuels like coal, gas or oil. Burning fossil fuels releases CO_2 into the atmosphere. Today, the concentration of CO_2 in the atmosphere is higher than at any point in time over the last 800,000 years. And it's the concentration of greenhouse gases like CO_2 that drives global temperature. Climate scientists agree: the build-up of greenhouse gases released by human activity in the atmosphere causes climate change. A rapid transition away from fossil fuels is possible and could contain global warming below +[2°C / 3.6°F], meaning 3.6°F. But if greenhouse gas emissions continue on their current trend, the average global warming will be +[4°C / 8°F] in 2100 and +[7°C / 13°F] in 2200. This may seem far away, but climate change is already affecting us right now in the places where we live.

- Because of climate change, in the U.S. hurricanes have become increasingly intense and cause much more harm and damages. Hurricane Katrina caused more than 1,800 deaths and more than 100 billion dollars in damages.
- The amount of air pollution generated by burning fossil fuels is already responsible for 200,000 deaths in the U.S. each year.
- Heatwaves are becoming longer, more frequent, and more severe. In the absence of ambitious action against climate change, the U.S. will experience 70 days of extreme heat per year (that is six times more than in the past) and up to 135 days a year in a State like Texas.
- In the South and in the Midwest, agricultural yields will decrease because of the heat.
- With the mix of more hurricanes, rising sea levels, more heatwaves, and lower agricultural output, the average income in Southern states will be 10 to 20% lower than it could be.
- In the North-East, the risk of heavy rain has already increased by 55%. More severe storms and rising sea levels will lead to more flooding.
- In the West, hotter and drier conditions are causing more wildfires. Since the mid 80s, the area burned by wildfires across the Western U.S. is estimated to have been twice what it would have been without climate change. This was even before accounting for the California wildfires last summer, which were by far the largest on record.

To tackle climate change, we need to bring greenhouse gas emissions close to zero. This is possible, but it requires a deep transformation in the sectors most responsible for emissions: energy, transport, and industry.

38. Were you able to watch and listen to the video until the end?
Yes; No, there was a technical problem; No, I skipped part of the video

39. From what was said in the video, if greenhouse gas emissions continue on their current trend, what will be the rise in global average temperature in 2100?
[1°C / 2°F]; [2°C / 3.6°F]; [4°C / 8°F]; [7°C / 15°F]; Don't know

40. [This question depends on the country, U.S. one is given] From what was said in the video, in the absence of ambitious action against climate change, how frequent will extreme temperatures (that is, temperature above 95°F) occur on average across the U.S. by the end of the century?
70 days per year; 80 days per year; 90 days per year; 100 days per year; Don't know

Climate policy video

We will now show you a 5 minute video (with sound) that summarizes the features of some policies proposed to fight climate change. Please pay attention to the information provided as you will be asked questions about it later. Do not skip forward or close the page while the video is running. Please proceed to the next page when you are ready.

- Australia: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_3gagRLUpgyAicVE
- Brazil: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_eCZzzoblKYpWKh0
- Canada (English): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_9Lekk0zTPurlzkG
- Canada (French): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_9twKmQCtMuJpfp4
- China: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_1ZhXvFBoUtvq7qK
- Denmark: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_39OXHJ3gT6p4U74
- France: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_6F2lryw2eo1eQNU
- Germany: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_9SvqNOCSY8ywnHw
- India (English): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_2mjlMdvMpAYJAuG

- India (Hindi): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_00696ZTnBDTFQ10
- Indonesia: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_1RqbYYeT2cOnOPc
- Italy: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_6mMBZqNPLgvUKZo
- Japan: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_0rCWm2QnbEfaR1k
- Mexico: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_3UbhIz7hb99f0wu
- Poland: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_etkOtRoDmoSXkSq
- South Africa (English): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_9FDOxYLGIwdrYh0
- South Africa (Zulu): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_1zij8ULej3rYsXs
- South Korea: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_4O2BSbDDYVUUhb8
- Spain: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_9ZCXWK6BphbFQWy
- Turkey: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_9RF3ckVwWR9MH1Y
- Ukraine (Ukrainian): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_bDbSZHrj0tU9b7w
- Ukraine (Russian): https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_3wr99GUKuUVgK3k
- United Kingdom: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_bg5w9RRYbGtMrwa
- United States: https://lse.eu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsControlPanel/File.php?F=F_bj5mFN15bJnlUbk

Below is the script used for the U.S.]

To fight climate change and avoid an ever-warming climate, we need an array of policies. Climate policies are needed to transform the way we produce energy, to make buildings greener, to put greener cars on the roads and reduce our fuel consumption. But these policies also need to protect people's jobs and incomes. Let's have a closer look on three possible climate policies.

Let's start with a policy that forces car producers to produce greener cars – a ban on combustion-engine cars. With a ban on combustion-engine cars, car producers are first required by law to produce cars that emit less CO_2 per [kilometre/mile]. The emission limit is lowered every year, so that only electric or hydrogen vehicles can be sold after 2030. Note that electric vehicles currently cannot travel as far and can be more expensive than cars that run on petrol. Together with a plan to produce electricity from clean sources, a ban on combustion-engine cars would accomplish the transition needed in the car industry.

Now, let's turn to a policy that combines a tax on carbon emissions to reduce emissions and cash transfers to protect people's purchasing power. With a carbon tax, all products that emit greenhouse gases would be taxed. For example, the price of gasoline would increase by [40 cents per gallon]. With a carbon tax, companies and people pay for the greenhouse gases they emit. This pushes them to reduce their emissions. To compensate people for the price increases, the revenues of the carbon tax would be redistributed to all households, regardless of their income. Each adult would thus receive [600 dollar] per year. On average, poorer people own smaller cars, live in smaller houses and fly less, so they use less fossil fuels than average. [The previous sentence is adapted in middle-income countries.] As they would receive the same cash transfer as everyone else, poorer people will generally gain from a carbon tax with cash transfers. Conversely, rich people will tend to lose. Does this policy work? Yes! The Canadian province of British Columbia has a carbon tax with cash transfers since 2008. Research has shown that this policy has decreased carbon emissions, increased employment, and made a majority of people richer. The last policy is a large program of public investment in green infrastructure, which would be financed by additional debt taken up by the government. A green infrastructure program would bring about the transition in energy infrastructure needed to halt climate change but it could come at the expense of other possible projects funded by the government. In [the U.S.], such a programme could create [4 million] jobs in green sectors, such as public transportation, renewable power plants, buildings' insulation, or sustainable agriculture, but [2 million] of people could lose their job in the fossil fuel industry. In general, all climate policies have the potential to transform the economy into a greener, safer, less polluted world. This green transformation has some downsides: people will have to change their habits, and some people will even have to change job. For example, there will be less demand for polluting sectors such as coal mining. But re-training options would be offered to workers in these sectors to ensure that they could find a new job elsewhere. And the green transition also comes with benefits: a safer world for future generations of course, but also less pollution. And climate policies can be designed to protect poor and middle-class households, as they can have more income with the carbon tax

with cash transfers, and more jobs with a green infrastructure program. We have focused on three important policies, but many others would be useful to fight climate change, including funding research into green technologies, subsidising the insulation of buildings, or stopping deforestation. To stop climate change, we probably need all of them together.

41. Were you able to watch and listen to the video until the end?
Yes; No, there was a technical problem; No, I skipped part of the video

42. The video presented three climate policies. What was the first policy about?
A ban on combustion-engine cars; A ban on short-haul flights; A ban on coal power plants; A ban on single-use plastic bags; Don't know

43. The green infrastructure program described in the video would be financed by:
Additional government debt; Taxes on the wealthiest; Increase in the VAT (value-added tax); Reduction in social spending; Don't know

Climate knowledge

44. How often do you think or talk with people about climate change?
Almost never; Several times a year; Several times a month

45. In your opinion, is climate change real?
Yes; No

46. (If "Yes" to 45) What part of climate change do you think is due to human activity?
None; A little; Some; A lot; Most

47. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "Climate change is an important problem."
Strongly disagree; Somewhat disagree; Neither agree nor disagree; Somewhat agree; Strongly agree

48. How knowledgeable do you consider yourself about climate change?
Not at all; A little; Moderately; A lot; A great deal

49. Greenhouse gases are gases that trap heat in the atmosphere and make the Earth warmer, causing climate change. In particular, the burning of fossil fuels and agricultural production emit greenhouse gases. Which of the following elements contribute to climate change? (Multiple answers are possible)
CO_2; Hydrogen; Methane; Particulate matter

50. Do you think that cutting global greenhouse gas emissions by half would be sufficient to eventually stop temperatures from rising?
Yes; No

    For the next three questions we would like you to rank the items according to the greenhouse gas emissions they emit, to the best of your knowledge (where 1 is the item

that emits the most and 3 the item that emits the least). The greenhouse gas emissions of a product are those emitted at all steps involved in its production and distribution.

51. If a [family of 4 or couple or person, depending on the country] travels [500 km from New York City to Toronto (for the U.S.)], with which mode of transportation do they emit the most greenhouse gases? Please rank the items from 1 (most) to 3 (least) (by clicking and dragging the items).
Car (running on diesel or gasoline); [Coach or Train, depending on the country]; Plane

52. Which dish emits the most greenhouse gases? We consider that each dish weighs half a pound. Please rank the items from 1 (most) to 3 (least) (by clicking and dragging the items).
A [beef] steak; One serving of [pasta]; Chicken wings

53. Which source of electric energy emits the most greenhouse gases to provide power for a house? Please rank the items from 1 (most) to 3 (least) (by clicking and dragging the items).
Gas-fired power plant; Nuclear power plant; Coal-fired power station

54. Which region contributes most to global greenhouse gas emissions? Please rank the regions from 1 (most) to 4 (least) and note that multiple regions may have the same rank.

    - The U.S.
    - The European Union
    - China
    - India

    1; 2; 3; 4

55. Consider now per capita emissions: in which region does the consumption of an average person contribute most to greenhouse gas emissions? Please rank the regions from 1 (most) to [4 / 5] (least).

    - The U.S.
    - The European Union
    - China
    - India
    - [Country, if not above or not in the E.U.]

    1; 2; 3; 4; [5]

56. If nothing is done to limit climate change, how likely do you think it is that climate change will lead to the following events?

- Severe droughts and heatwaves
- More frequent volcanic eruptions
- Rising sea levels
- Lower agricultural production
- Drop in standards of living
- Larger migration flows
- More armed conflicts
- Extinction of humankind

Very unlikely; Somewhat unlikely; Somewhat likely; Very likely

Attitudes and risks

57. To what extent are the following groups responsible for climate change in [country]?

    - Each of us
    - The high income earners
    - [country] government
    - Companies
    - Previous generations

    Not at all; A little; Moderately; A lot; A great deal

58. To what extent do you think that it is technically feasible to stop greenhouse gas emissions by the end of the century while [maintaining / sustaining] satisfactory standards of living in [country]?
    Not at all; A little; Moderately; A lot; A great deal

59. To what extent do you think climate change already affects or will affect your personal life negatively?
    Not at all; A little; Moderately; A lot; A great deal

60. How likely is it that human kind halts climate change by the end of the century?
    Very unlikely; Somewhat unlikely; Somewhat likely; Very likely

61. If we decide to halt climate change through ambitious policies, what would be the effects on [country] economy and employment?
    Very negative effects; Somewhat negative effects; No noticeable effects; Somewhat positive effects; Very positive effects

62. If we decide to halt climate change through ambitious policies, to what extent do you think it would negatively affect your lifestyle?
    Not at all; A little; Moderately; A lot; A great deal

63. Here are possible behaviors that experts say would help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. To what extent would you be willing to adopt the following behaviors?

    - Limit flying
    - Limit driving
    - Have an electric vehicle
    - Limit [beef / India: meat] consumption
    - Limit heating or cooling your home

    Not at all; A little; Moderately; A lot; A great deal

64. How important are the factors below in order for you to adopt a sustainable lifestyle (i.e. limit driving, flying, and consumption, cycle more, etc.)?

    - Ambitious climate policies
    - Having enough financial support
    - People around you also changing their behavior
    - The most well-off also changing their behavior

    Not at all; A little; Moderately; A lot; A great deal

Policy 1: Ban on the sale of combustion-engine cars

To fight climate change, car producers can be required by law to produce cars that emit less CO**2** per [kilometer / mile] of the cars they sell. The emission limit is lowered every year so that only electric or hydrogen vehicles can be sold after 2030. This policy is called a ban on combustion-engine cars. We will now ask you a few questions regarding this specific policy.

65. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? A ban on combustion engine cars would...

    - reduce CO_2 emissions from cars
    - reduce air pollution
    - have a

      $$negative/positive(randomized)$$

      effect on [country] economy and employment
    - have a large effect on [country] economy and employment
    - be a

      $$costly/costless(randomized)$$

      way to fight climate change

Strongly disagree; Somewhat disagree; Neither agree nor disagree; Somewhat agree; Strongly agree

66. In your view, would the following groups win or lose if a ban on combustion-engine cars was implemented in [country]?

    - Low-income earners
    - The middle class
    - High-income earners
    - Those living in rural areas

    Lose a lot; Mostly lose; Neither win nor lose; Mostly win; Win a lot

67. Do you think that your household would win or lose financially from a ban on combustion-engine cars?
    Lose a lot; Mostly lose; Neither win nor lose; Mostly win; Win a lot

68. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "A ban on combustion-engine cars is fair"?
    Strongly disagree; Somewhat disagree; Neither agree nor disagree; Somewhat agree; Strongly agree

69. Do you support or oppose a ban on combustion-engine cars?
    Strongly oppose; Somewhat oppose; Neither support nor oppose; Somewhat support; Strongly support

70. Do you support or oppose a ban on combustion-engine cars where alternatives such as public transports are made available to people?
    Strongly oppose; Somewhat oppose; Neither support nor oppose; Somewhat support; Strongly support

Policy 2: Green infrastructure program

A green infrastructure program is a large public investment program, which would be financed by additional public debt, to accomplish the transition needed to cut greenhouse gas emissions. Investments would concern renewable power plants, public transport, thermal renovation of buildings, and sustainable agriculture. We will now ask you a few questions regarding this specific policy.

71. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? A green infrastructure program would...

    - make electricity production greener
    - increase the use of public transport

- reduce air pollution
- have a negative effect on [country] economy and employment
- have a large effect on [country] economy and employment
- be a costly way to fight climate change

Strongly disagree; Somewhat disagree; Neither agree nor disagree; Somewhat agree; Strongly agree

72. In your view, would the following groups win or lose with a green infrastructure program?

    - Low-income earners
    - The middle class
    - High-income earners
    - Those living in rural areas

    Lose a lot; Mostly lose; Neither win nor lose; Mostly win; Win a lot

73. Do you think that your household would win or lose financially from a green infrastructure program?
    Lose a lot; Mostly lose; Neither win nor lose; Mostly win; Win a lot

74. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "A green infrastructure program is fair"?
    Strongly disagree; Somewhat disagree; Neither agree nor disagree; Somewhat agree; Strongly agree

75. Do you support or oppose a green infrastructure program?
    Strongly oppose; Somewhat oppose; Neither support nor oppose; Somewhat support; Strongly support

76. Until now, we have considered that a green infrastructure program would be financed by public debt, but other sources of funding are possible.

    What sources of funding do you find appropriate for public investments in green infrastructure? (Multiple answers are possible)
    Additional public debt; Increase in the [sales tax / VAT (value-added tax)]; Increase in taxes on the wealthiest; Reduction in social spending; Reduction in military spending

Policy 3: Carbon tax with cash transfers

To fight climate change, [country] government can make greenhouse gas emissions costly, to make people and firms change their equipment and reduce their emissions. The government could do this through a policy called a carbon tax with cash transfers. Under such a

policy, the government would tax all products that emit greenhouse gas. For example, the price of gasoline would increase by [40 cents per gallon]. To compensate households for the price increases, the revenues from the carbon tax would be redistributed to all households, regardless of their income. Each adult would thus receive [600 dollar] per year.[29] We will now ask you a few questions regarding this specific policy.

77. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? A carbon tax with cash transfers would...

    - encourage people to drive less
    - encourage people and companies to insulate buildings
    - reduce the use of fossil fuels and greenhouse gas emissions
    - reduce air pollution
    - have a negative effect on [country] economy and employment
    - have a large effect on [country] economy and employment
    - be a costly way to fight climate change

    Strongly disagree; Somewhat disagree; Neither agree nor disagree; Somewhat agree; Strongly agree

78. In your view, would the following groups win or lose under a carbon tax with cash transfers?

    - Low-income earners
    - The middle class
    - High-income earners
    - Those living in rural areas

    Lose a lot; Mostly lose; Neither win nor lose; Mostly win; Win a lot

79. Do you think that your household would win or lose financially under a carbon tax with cash transfers?
    Lose a lot; Mostly lose; Neither win nor lose; Mostly win; Win a lot

80. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "A carbon tax with cash transfers is fair"?
    Strongly disagree; Somewhat disagree; Neither agree nor disagree; Somewhat agree; Strongly agree

[29] The tax considered is (implicitly) set at \$45 per ton of CO_2 (see Appendix A-7.1.1 for details of the computation.

81. Do you support or oppose a carbon tax with cash transfers?
Strongly oppose; Somewhat oppose; Neither support nor oppose; Somewhat support; Strongly support

82. Now, we consider a variant of the policy where the cash transfers are higher for low-income people compared to high-income people. Do you agree or disagree that such a policy would be fair?
Strongly disagree; Somewhat disagree; Neither agree nor disagree; Somewhat agree; Strongly agree

83. Do you support or oppose a carbon tax with cash transfers with higher transfers for low-income people compared to high-income people?
Strongly oppose; Somewhat oppose; Neither support nor oppose; Somewhat support; Strongly support

Preferences on climate policies

84. [**Attention check question**] To show that you are attentive, please select "a little" in the following list: Not at all; A little; Moderately; A lot; A great deal

85. Do you support or oppose the following climate policies?

    - A tax on flying (that increases ticket prices by 20%)
    - A national tax on fossil fuels (increasing gasoline prices by [40 cents per gallon])
    - A ban of polluting vehicles in dense areas, like city centers
    - Subsidies for low-carbon technologies (renewable energy, capture and storage of carbon...)
    - A contribution to a global climate fund to finance clean energy in low-income countries

    Strongly oppose; Somewhat oppose; Neither support nor oppose; Somewhat support; Strongly support

86. Governments can use the revenues from carbon taxes in different ways. Would you support or oppose introducing a carbon tax that would raise gasoline prices by [40 cents per gallon], if the government used this revenue to finance...

    - Cash transfers to households with no alternative to using fossil fuels
    - Cash transfers to the poorest households
    - Equal cash transfers to all households
    - A reduction in personal income taxes
    - A reduction in corporate income taxes

- Tax rebates for the most affected firms
- Funding environmental infrastructure projects (public transport, cycling ways, etc.)
- Subsidizing low-carbon technologies, including renewable energy
- A reduction in the public deficit

Strongly oppose; Somewhat oppose; Neither support nor oppose; Somewhat support; Strongly support

Willingness to pay and real stake questions

87. To fight global warming, [country] government could implement a policy package to reduce emissions, for example by investing in clean technologies (renewable energy, electric vehicles, public transport, more efficient insulation, etc.). The funding for these investments could be collected annually through an additional individual contribution for the foreseeable future. Assume that everyone in [country] as well as citizens of other countries would be required to contribute according to their means. Are you willing to pay ([$10 / $30 / $50 / $100 / $300 /$500 / $1,000]) annually through an additional individual contribution to limit global warming to safe levels (less than 2 degrees Celsius)?
Yes; No

88. By taking this survey, you are automatically entered into a lottery to win [$100]. In a few days you will know whether you have been selected in the lottery. The payment will be made to you in the same way as your compensation for this survey, so no further action is required on your part. You can also donate a part of this additional compensation (should you be selected in the lottery) to a reforestation project through the charity The Gold Standard. This charity has already proven effective to reduce 151 million tons of CO_2 to fight climate change and has been carefully selected by our team. The Gold Standard is highly transparent and ensures that its projects feature the highest levels of environmental integrity and contribute to sustainable development. Should you win the lottery, please enter your donation amount using the slider below:
Slider going from 0 to [100]

International burden-sharing

89. At which level(s) do you think public policies to tackle climate change need to be put in place? (Multiple answers are possible)
Global; [Federal / European / ...]; [State / National]; Local

90. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "[country] should take measures to fight climate change."

Strongly disagree; Somewhat disagree; Neither agree nor disagree; Somewhat agree; Strongly agree

91. How should [country] climate policies depend on what other countries do?

    - If other countries do more, [country] should do...
    - If other countries do less, [country] should do...

    Much less; Less; About the same; More; Much more

92. [In all countries but the U.S., Denmark and France] All countries have signed the Paris agreement that aims to contain global warming "well below +2 °C". To limit global warming to this level, there is a maximum amount of greenhouse gases we can emit globally, called the carbon budget. Each country could aim to emit less than a share of the carbon budget. To respect the global carbon budget, countries that emit more than their national share would pay a fee to countries that emit less than their share. Do you support such a policy?
    Strongly oppose; Somewhat oppose; Neither support nor oppose; Somewhat support; Strongly support

93. [In all countries but the U.S., Denmark and France] Suppose the above policy is in place. How should the carbon budget be divided among countries?
    The emission share of a country should be proportional to its population, so that each human has an equal right to emit.; The emission share of a country should be proportional to its current emissions, so that those who already emit more have more rights to emit.; Countries that have emitted more over the past decades (from 1990 onwards) should receive a lower emission share, because they have already used some of their fair share.; Countries that will be hurt more by climate change should receive a higher emission share, to compensate them for the damages.

94. [In the U.S., Denmark, and France only] To achieve a given reduction of greenhouse gas emissions globally, costly investments are needed. Ideally, how should countries bear the costs of fighting climate change?

    - Countries should pay in proportion to their income
    - Countries should pay in proportion to their current emissions
    - Countries should pay in proportion to their past emissions (from 1990 onwards)
    - The richest countries should pay it all, so that the poorest countries do not have to pay anything
    - The richest countries should pay even more, to help vulnerable countries face adverse consequences: vulnerable countries would then receive money instead of paying

Strongly disagree; Somewhat disagree; Neither agree nor disagree; Somewhat agree; Strongly agree

95. Do you support or oppose establishing a global democratic assembly whose role would be to draft international treaties against climate change? Each adult across the world would have one vote to elect members of the assembly.
Strongly oppose; Somewhat oppose; Neither support nor oppose; Somewhat support; Strongly support

96. Imagine the following policy: a global tax on greenhouse gas emissions funding a global basic income. Such a policy would progressively raise the price of fossil fuels (for example, the price of gasoline would increase by [40 cents per gallon] in the first years). Higher prices would encourage people and companies to use less fossil fuels, reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Revenues from the tax would be used to finance a basic income of [$30] per month to each human adult, thereby lifting the 700 million people who earn less than $2/day out of extreme poverty. The average British person would lose a bit from this policy as they would face [$130] per month in price increases, which is higher than the [$30] they would receive.

    Do you support or oppose such a policy?
Strongly oppose; Somewhat oppose; Neither support nor oppose; Somewhat support; Strongly support

97. Do you support or oppose a tax on all millionaires around the world to finance low-income countries that comply with international standards regarding climate action? This would finance infrastructure and public services such as access to drinking water, healthcare, and education.
Strongly oppose; Somewhat oppose; Neither support nor oppose; Somewhat support; Strongly support

Housing and cattle products

(In Brazil, Mexico, India, and Indonesia, these 5 questions on heating were not asked. In Australia, they were asked with *cooling* instead of *heating*.)

98. (If "Owner" or "Landlord renting out" at 19) How likely is it that you will improve the insulation or replace the heating system of your accommodation over the next 5 years?
Very unlikely; Somewhat unlikely; Somewhat likely; Very likely

99. (If "Owner" or "Landlord renting out" at 19) What are the main hurdles preventing you from improving the insulation or replace the heating system of your accommodation? (Multiple answers are possible)
The choice to insulate or replace the heating system is not mine; The upfront costs are too high; It is too much effort; It won't improve its energy efficiency; My insulation and heating systems are already satisfactory

100. GROUP 1. Imagine that [country] government makes it mandatory for all residential buildings to have insulation that meets a certain energy efficiency standard before 2040. The government would subsidise half of the insulation costs to help households with the transition. Do you support or oppose such policy?

101. GROUP 2. Imagine that [country] government makes it mandatory for all residential buildings to have insulation that meets a certain energy efficiency standard before 2040. The government would subsidise half of the insulation costs to help households with the transition. Insulating your home can take long, may cause disruptions to your daily life during the renovation works, and may even require you to leave your home until the renovation is completed. Do you support or oppose such policy?
Strongly oppose; Somewhat oppose; Neither support nor oppose; Somewhat support; Strongly support

102. Imagine that [country] government makes it mandatory for all residential buildings to have insulation that meets a certain energy efficiency standard before 2040. The government would subsidise half of the insulation costs to help households with the transition. Insulating your home can take long, may cause disruptions to your daily life during the renovation works, and may even require you to leave your home until the renovation is completed. Do you support or oppose such policy?
Strongly oppose; Somewhat oppose; Neither support nor oppose; Somewhat support; Strongly support

103. (In India, this question was skipped.) Imagine that, in order to fight climate change, [country] government decides to limit the consumption of cattle products like beef and dairy. Do you support or oppose the following options?

    - A high tax on cattle products, so that the price of beef doubles
    - Subsidies on organic and local vegetables, fruits, and nuts
    - The removal of subsidies for cattle farming
    - The ban of intensive cattle farming

    Strongly oppose; Somewhat oppose; Neither support nor oppose; Somewhat support; Strongly support

Trust, perceptions of institutions, inequality, and the future

104. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "Most people can be trusted."
Strongly disagree; Somewhat disagree; Neither agree nor disagree; Somewhat agree; Strongly agree

105. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "Over the last decade, [country] government could generally be trusted to do what is right."

Strongly disagree; Somewhat disagree; Neither agree nor disagree; Somewhat agree; Strongly agree

106. Some people think the government is trying to do too many things that should be left to individuals and businesses. Others think that the government should do more to solve our country's problems. Which come closer to your own view?
Government is doing too much; Government is doing just the right amount; Government should do more

107. How big of an issue do you think income inequality is in [country]?
Not an issue at all; A small issue; An issue; A serious issue; A very serious issue

108. Do you think that overall people in the world will be richer or poorer in 100 years from now?
Much poorer; Poorer; As rich as now; Richer; Much richer

Feedback

109. Do you feel that this survey was politically biased?
Yes, left-wing biased; Yes, right-wing biased; No, I do not feel it was biased

110. The survey is nearing completion. You can now enter any comments, thoughts or suggestions in the field below.

Petition

111. Finally, are you willing to sign a petition to "stand up for real climate action"? As soon as the survey is complete, we will send the results to the [head of state's] office, informing him what share of people who took this survey were willing to support the following petition. "I agree that immediate action on climate change is critical. Now is the time to dedicate ourselves to a low-carbon future and prevent lasting damage to all living things. Science shows us we cannot afford to wait to cut harmful carbon emissions. I'm adding my voice to the call to world leaders in [country] and beyond – to act so we do not lose ground in combating climate change." Do you support this petition (you will NOT be asked to sign, only your answer here is required and remains anonymous)?
Yes; No

A-6 Robustness checks

A-6.1 Treatment effects among attentive respondents

Table A14 shows that treatment effects are higher (often by about 50%) among respondents who pay attention to the video treatments and respond correctly to at least one of the comprehension questions after the video.

Table A14: Effects of the treatments on support for climate action, among respondents who respond correctly to at least one of the comprehension questions

	Support or Agreement				
	Green infrastructure program	Ban on combustion-engine cars	Carbon tax with cash transfers	Fairness of main climate policies index	Adopt climate-friendly behaviors
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Control group mean	0.656	0.517	0.46	-0.08	-0.034
Treatment: Climate impacts	0.049***	0.044***	0.051***	0.078***	0.105***
	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.018)	(0.018)
Treatment: Climate policy	0.046***	0.061***	0.117***	0.160***	0.030*
	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.017)	(0.018)
Treatment: Both	0.082***	0.107***	0.169***	0.246***	0.117***
	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.018)	(0.018)
Observations	31,661	31,661	31,661	31,661	31,661
R^2	0.105	0.101	0.109	0.160	0.111

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of variables listed in the columns on socioeconomic characteristics, controlling for country fixed effects. Only the coefficients for the treatment effects are displayed. Dependent variables are indicator variables equal to 1 if the respondent (somewhat or strongly) supports each of the main climate policies (columns 1, 2, 3), or indices (4, 5). Robust standard errors are in parentheses *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

A-6.2 Main results on different samples

After the questions on the three main policies, one question asked respondents to tick "A little" in a 5-point scale ranging from "Not at all" to "A lot" to test their attention. Among the 45,904 complete responses with a duration deemed sufficient (above 11 min),[30] 40,680 succeed the attention test (89%). The latter constitute our benchmark sample. In Tables A15 to A20, we reproduce the main results among the extended sample that also includes respondents who failed the test of attention. All descriptive statistics and coefficients are very close in the extended sample, showing that our results are robust to the inclusion of respondents who lack attention.

Conversely, if we choose a higher cutoff for the minimal duration and retain only the 30,775 respondents who answered in more than 20 minutes, we also obtain descriptive statistics and coefficients very close to our benchmark results (tables are not shown for the sake of brevity).

[30]This duration cutoff was negotiated by the survey company, as one-third of the median duration is the usually cutoff.

Table A15: Correlation between knowledge and individual characteristics on the extended sample

	Knowledge of climate change				
	Knowledge index	Footprint	Fundamentals	Greenhouse gases	Impacts
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Control group mean	-0.065	-0.022	-0.035	-0.107	0.006
Panel A: Socio-economic indicators					
Gender: Woman	−0.120***	−0.070***	−0.003	−0.123***	−0.105***
	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)
Lives with child(ren) under 14	−0.147***	−0.112***	−0.045***	−0.097***	−0.107***
	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.013)
Age: 25 - 34	−0.061***	0.001	−0.085***	−0.060***	−0.013
	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.022)
Age: 35 - 49	−0.016	0.043**	−0.074***	−0.061***	0.054***
	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.019)	(0.021)	(0.020)
Age: 50 or older	0.178***	0.217***	−0.044**	0.065***	0.177***
	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.019)
Household income: Q2	0.109***	0.031**	0.048***	0.120***	0.073***
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)
Household income: Q3	0.130***	0.066***	0.043**	0.125***	0.095***
	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Household income: Q4	0.208***	0.128***	0.060***	0.161***	0.164***
	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)
Highest diploma: College	0.424***	0.227***	0.226***	0.288***	0.316***
	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.023)	(0.023)
Highest diploma: High school	0.268***	0.114***	0.151***	0.197***	0.211***
	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.022)
Economic Leaning: Very Left	−0.056**	−0.079***	0.078***	−0.041	−0.096***
	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.026)
Economic Leaning: Center	−0.215***	−0.178***	−0.159***	−0.086***	−0.101***
	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Economic Leaning: Right	−0.294***	−0.195***	−0.299***	−0.106***	−0.144***
	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)
Economic Leaning: Very Right	−0.416***	−0.306***	−0.258***	−0.183***	−0.284***
	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.023)
Treatment: Climate Impacts	0.146***	0.059***	0.107***	0.163***	0.030*
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)
Treatment: Climate Policies	0.037**	0.011	−0.003	0.119***	−0.041***
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.016)
Treatment: Both	0.096***	0.031*	0.041**	0.171***	−0.010
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)
Panel B: Energy usage indicators					
Agglomeration size: Small	−0.005	0.024	−0.022	−0.041**	0.028
	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)
Agglomeration size: Medium	0.052**	0.053**	0.028	0.002	0.042**
	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)
Agglomeration size: Large	0.077***	0.061***	0.067***	−0.005	0.063***
	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.019)
Public transport available	0.026**	−0.034***	0.038***	0.018	0.061***
	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)
Uses car	0.098***	0.021	0.073***	0.068***	0.091***
	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)
High gas expenses	−0.084***	−0.068***	−0.027**	−0.061***	−0.058***
	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)
High heating expenses	−0.013	−0.036***	0.004	0.020	−0.011
	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)
Flies more than once a year	0.026**	0.018	0.032**	−0.007	0.025*
	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.013)	(0.013)
Works in polluting sector	−0.188***	−0.113***	−0.083***	−0.129***	−0.136***
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Eats beef/meat weekly or more	−0.038***	−0.055***	−0.056***	0.037***	−0.016
	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)
Owner or landlord	0.005	−0.020	−0.008	0.020	0.028**
	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)
Observations	45,904	45,904	45,904	45,904	45,904
R^2	0.075	0.037	0.024	0.036	0.042

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of the knowledge indices on socioeconomic indicators (Panel A) and on energy usage indicators (Panel B), controlling for country fixed effects. Panel B also controls for socioeconomic indicators, but the coefficients are not displayed. The dependent variable in column 1 is the *Knowledge index*, whose components are the indices in the remaining columns. Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

Table A16: Correlation between support for the main climate policies and individual characteristics on the extended sample

	Support			
	Main climate policies index	Green infrastructure program	Ban on combustion-engine cars	Carbon tax with cash transfers
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Control group mean	-0.095	0.648	0.51	0.46
Panel A: Socio-economic indicators				
Gender: Woman	0.060***	0.009*	0.009	−0.006
	(0.012)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Lives with child(ren) under 14	0.133***	0.031***	0.053***	0.058***
	(0.013)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Age: 25 - 34	0.048**	0.012	0.015	0.016
	(0.020)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Age: 35 - 49	0.083***	0.027***	0.036***	0.034***
	(0.019)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Age: 50 or older	0.179***	0.079***	0.090***	0.082***
	(0.017)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)
Household income: Q2	0.070***	0.034***	0.037***	0.021***
	(0.016)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Household income: Q3	0.089***	0.047***	0.045***	0.030***
	(0.017)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Household income: Q4	0.083***	0.049***	0.047***	0.037***
	(0.018)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.009)
Highest diploma: College	0.187***	0.105***	0.098***	0.076***
	(0.023)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.011)
Highest diploma: High school	0.120***	0.066***	0.056***	0.045***
	(0.022)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Economic Leaning: Very Left	0.114***	0.006	0.029**	0.026*
	(0.027)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.013)
Economic Leaning: Center	−0.214***	−0.109***	−0.101***	−0.098***
	(0.017)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Economic Leaning: Right	−0.302***	−0.112***	−0.097***	−0.071***
	(0.019)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Economic Leaning: Very Right	−0.169***	−0.114***	−0.061***	−0.052***
	(0.025)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.011)
Treatment: Climate Impacts	0.062***	0.017**	0.021***	0.031***
	(0.016)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Treatment: Climate Policies	0.132***	0.026***	0.047***	0.095***
	(0.016)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Treatment: Both	0.198***	0.041***	0.072***	0.117***
	(0.016)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Panel B: Energy usage indicators				
Agglomeration size: Small	0.039**	0.013	0.006	−0.004
	(0.019)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.009)
Agglomeration size: Medium	0.040*	0.022**	0.014	0.006
	(0.021)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Agglomeration size: Large	0.074***	0.025***	0.026***	0.009
	(0.020)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)
Public transport available	0.287***	0.093***	0.098***	0.112***
	(0.013)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Uses car	−0.132***	−0.015**	−0.050***	−0.039***
	(0.015)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
High gas expenses	−0.057***	−0.022***	−0.022***	−0.016***
	(0.013)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
High heating expenses	0.044***	0.034***	0.028***	0.028***
	(0.013)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Flies more than once a year	0.128***	0.044***	0.056***	0.060***
	(0.014)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Works in polluting sector	0.008	−0.005	−0.009	0.015**
	(0.016)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Eats beef/meat weekly or more	−0.057***	−0.024***	−0.026***	−0.007
	(0.012)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Owner or landlord	0.038***	0.014**	0.016**	0.023***
	(0.014)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Observations	45,904	45,904	45,904	45,904
R^2	0.068	0.110	0.107	0.117

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of the variables listed in the columns on socioeconomic characteristics (Panel A) and on energy usage characteristics (Panel B), controlling for country fixed effects. Panel B also controls for socioeconomic characteristics, but the coefficients are not displayed. The dependent variable in column 1 is the *Support for main policies index*, while the remaining columns are indicator variables equal to 1 if the respondent (somewhat or strongly) supports each of the policies. Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

Table A17: Correlation between *Support for main climate policies index* and individual characteristics in high-income countries on the extended sample

	Support for main climate policies index											
	AUS	CAN	DEU	DNK	ESP	FRA	GBR	ITA	JPN	KOR	POL	USA
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Control group mean	-0.203	-0.12	-0.092	-0.138	-0.1	-0.076	-0.119	-0.17	-0.095	-0.075	-0.06	0.026
Panel A: Socio-economic indicators												
Gender: Woman	−0.005	−0.108**	−0.064	0.144***	0.074*	0.050	0.030	0.034	0.187***	−0.059	0.093**	0.015
	(0.053)	(0.047)	(0.050)	(0.050)	(0.042)	(0.054)	(0.049)	(0.045)	(0.053)	(0.052)	(0.045)	(0.047)
Lives with child(ren) under 14	0.211***	0.164***	0.135**	−0.006	0.118**	0.185***	0.177***	0.142**	0.095	0.055	0.145***	0.075
	(0.061)	(0.051)	(0.065)	(0.062)	(0.048)	(0.064)	(0.058)	(0.059)	(0.066)	(0.066)	(0.051)	(0.050)
Age: 25 - 34	−0.105	−0.006	−0.210**	0.050	0.021	−0.009	−0.010	−0.170*	0.101	0.067	−0.107	0.179**
	(0.079)	(0.090)	(0.095)	(0.096)	(0.076)	(0.092)	(0.079)	(0.094)	(0.103)	(0.102)	(0.084)	(0.076)
Age: 35 - 49	−0.106	−0.154*	−0.183**	−0.057	−0.083	−0.193**	0.163**	−0.103	0.189*	0.124	0.001	0.153*
	(0.084)	(0.086)	(0.093)	(0.089)	(0.070)	(0.085)	(0.079)	(0.085)	(0.097)	(0.096)	(0.076)	(0.079)
Age: 50 or older	−0.233***	−0.057	−0.251***	−0.039	0.024	−0.297***	−0.041	−0.073	0.398***	0.405***	0.243***	−0.193***
	(0.080)	(0.080)	(0.091)	(0.087)	(0.064)	(0.084)	(0.076)	(0.077)	(0.090)	(0.086)	(0.072)	(0.074)
Household income: Q2	0.118**	0.065	−0.060	−0.047	0.103*	−0.136**	−0.048	0.075	0.118*	0.068	0.163***	−0.002
	(0.052)	(0.066)	(0.071)	(0.069)	(0.058)	(0.062)	(0.064)	(0.059)	(0.064)	(0.068)	(0.063)	(0.056)
Household income: Q3	0.199***	0.036	0.024	−0.017	0.125**	−0.071	0.021	0.123*	0.166**	0.173***	0.111*	−0.045
	(0.066)	(0.067)	(0.072)	(0.069)	(0.061)	(0.075)	(0.065)	(0.064)	(0.068)	(0.065)	(0.063)	(0.070)
Household income: Q4	0.100	0.028	−0.080	−0.074	0.097	−0.099	0.047	0.203***	0.098	0.130	0.164**	0.065
	(0.090)	(0.076)	(0.074)	(0.084)	(0.062)	(0.083)	(0.072)	(0.071)	(0.075)	(0.084)	(0.068)	(0.080)
Highest diploma: College	0.281***	0.028	0.005	0.239***	0.156**	0.073	0.345***	0.203**	0.305*	−0.505***	−0.112	0.346***
	(0.099)	(0.084)	(0.078)	(0.089)	(0.067)	(0.088)	(0.075)	(0.079)	(0.168)	(0.156)	(0.155)	(0.111)
Highest diploma: High school	0.065	−0.100	−0.139**	0.164**	0.131*	−0.053	0.120*	0.117*	0.173	−0.606***	−0.132	0.188*
	(0.093)	(0.081)	(0.069)	(0.083)	(0.067)	(0.077)	(0.071)	(0.066)	(0.167)	(0.159)	(0.151)	(0.103)
Economic Leaning: Very Left	0.020	−0.025	0.109	0.484***	0.089	−0.296	0.091	−0.005	0.230	0.005	−0.154	0.309***
	(0.119)	(0.111)	(0.133)	(0.135)	(0.071)	(0.191)	(0.123)	(0.081)	(0.192)	(0.165)	(0.095)	(0.083)
Economic Leaning: Center	−0.496***	−0.378***	−0.357***	−0.282***	−0.267***	−0.068	−0.425***	−0.270***	−0.180**	−0.411***	−0.098	−0.343***
	(0.072)	(0.066)	(0.066)	(0.064)	(0.051)	(0.080)	(0.068)	(0.056)	(0.073)	(0.072)	(0.061)	(0.059)
Economic Leaning: Right	−0.653***	−0.510***	−0.656***	−0.666***	−0.560***	−0.233***	−0.373***	−0.265***	−0.271***	−0.460***	−0.330***	−0.777***
	(0.089)	(0.080)	(0.087)	(0.073)	(0.065)	(0.080)	(0.081)	(0.066)	(0.093)	(0.086)	(0.079)	(0.076)
Economic Leaning: Very Right	−0.475***	−0.640***	−0.506***	−0.535***	−0.673***	−0.530***	−0.081	−0.502***	−0.616***	−0.463***	−0.420***	−0.755***
	(0.133)	(0.121)	(0.150)	(0.168)	(0.092)	(0.116)	(0.111)	(0.102)	(0.156)	(0.153)	(0.097)	(0.085)
Treatment: Climate Impacts	0.214***	0.014	0.025	0.147**	0.012	0.020	0.065	0.128**	0.044	0.039	0.064	−0.071
	(0.074)	(0.066)	(0.066)	(0.065)	(0.058)	(0.070)	(0.061)	(0.064)	(0.067)	(0.069)	(0.060)	(0.061)
Treatment: Climate Policies	0.239***	0.246***	0.174**	0.128*	0.106*	0.058	0.127**	0.267***	0.156**	0.100	0.128**	−0.013
	(0.069)	(0.066)	(0.070)	(0.065)	(0.060)	(0.071)	(0.064)	(0.060)	(0.067)	(0.072)	(0.061)	(0.064)
Treatment: Both	0.332***	0.228***	0.166**	0.261***	0.276***	0.187**	0.284***	0.317***	0.190***	0.183***	0.129**	0.053
	(0.077)	(0.061)	(0.066)	(0.068)	(0.056)	(0.076)	(0.062)	(0.063)	(0.069)	(0.068)	(0.062)	(0.066)
Panel B: Energy usage indicators												
Agglomeration size: Small	0.065	0.045	0.009	0.292***	0.035	0.097	0.088	0.228***	0.078	0.082	−0.019	0.068
	(0.103)	(0.084)	(0.075)	(0.069)	(0.081)	(0.066)	(0.071)	(0.067)	(0.150)	(0.173)	(0.063)	(0.066)
Agglomeration size: Medium	0.073	0.086	0.032	0.283***	0.083	0.119	0.103	0.183**	0.141	0.128	−0.004	−0.019
	(0.108)	(0.089)	(0.083)	(0.070)	(0.083)	(0.087)	(0.083)	(0.078)	(0.150)	(0.179)	(0.068)	(0.076)
Agglomeration size: Large	0.063	0.063	0.026	0.270***	0.070	0.198**	0.200***	0.053	0.115	0.061	−0.002	0.208***
	(0.103)	(0.084)	(0.083)	(0.075)	(0.081)	(0.099)	(0.077)	(0.087)	(0.148)	(0.171)	(0.071)	(0.070)
Public transport available	0.392***	0.316***	0.272***	0.317***	0.243***	0.232***	0.278***	0.229***	0.031	0.227***	0.183***	0.352***
	(0.053)	(0.049)	(0.051)	(0.049)	(0.045)	(0.057)	(0.046)	(0.057)	(0.055)	(0.053)	(0.049)	(0.048)
Uses car	−0.232***	−0.142**	−0.289***	−0.106*	−0.213***	−0.323***	−0.293***	−0.150**	−0.208***	−0.148**	−0.286***	−0.043
	(0.072)	(0.066)	(0.059)	(0.055)	(0.051)	(0.078)	(0.054)	(0.067)	(0.068)	(0.062)	(0.058)	(0.060)
High gas expenses	−0.042	−0.143***	−0.184***	−0.220***	0.047	−0.024	−0.075	0.129***	−0.083	−0.021	−0.070	−0.034
	(0.053)	(0.050)	(0.052)	(0.049)	(0.045)	(0.056)	(0.052)	(0.046)	(0.062)	(0.056)	(0.048)	(0.048)
High heating expenses	0.109**	0.050	0.117**	0.051	−0.003	0.012	0.056	−0.049	0.090*	0.149***	0.113**	0.101**
	(0.054)	(0.051)	(0.051)	(0.050)	(0.044)	(0.055)	(0.045)	(0.047)	(0.050)	(0.053)	(0.049)	(0.047)
Flies more than once a year	0.161***	0.087	0.140**	0.087*	0.161***	0.026	−0.076	0.157***	0.168***	0.156***	0.136**	0.155***
	(0.055)	(0.053)	(0.057)	(0.048)	(0.044)	(0.069)	(0.049)	(0.051)	(0.059)	(0.054)	(0.058)	(0.049)
Works in polluting sector	−0.054	−0.108	0.128*	−0.034	0.066	0.067	0.056	0.006	−0.040	0.058	0.050	0.115*
	(0.071)	(0.070)	(0.070)	(0.080)	(0.065)	(0.072)	(0.070)	(0.080)	(0.071)	(0.065)	(0.059)	(0.066)
Eats beef/meat weekly or more	−0.095**	−0.089*	−0.160***	−0.256***	−0.200***	−0.197***	−0.019	−0.046	0.026	−0.040	−0.070	−0.075
	(0.049)	(0.047)	(0.055)	(0.048)	(0.042)	(0.051)	(0.046)	(0.046)	(0.054)	(0.059)	(0.063)	(0.050)
Owner or landlord	0.071	0.053	0.007	−0.063	−0.014	0.079	0.081	−0.005	0.162***	0.009	0.017	−0.071
	(0.056)	(0.055)	(0.054)	(0.055)	(0.048)	(0.063)	(0.053)	(0.056)	(0.056)	(0.057)	(0.057)	(0.058)
Observations	2,211	2,238	2,190	2,267	2,427	2,234	2,390	2,260	2,127	2,069	2,223	2,642
R^2	0.170	0.107	0.134	0.215	0.123	0.123	0.154	0.088	0.083	0.111	0.073	0.246

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of *Support for main policies index* on socioeconomic indicators (Panel A) and on energy usage indicators (Panel B). Panel B also controls for socioeconomic indicators, but the coefficients are not displayed. Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

Table A18: Correlation between *Support for main climate policies index* and individual characteristics in middle-income countries on the extended sample

	Support for main climate policies index							
	BRA	CHN	IDN	IND	MEX	TUR	UKR	ZAF
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Control group mean	-0.119	-0.114	-0.044	-0.091	-0.082	-0.048	-0.112	-0.115
Panel A: Socio-economic indicators								
Gender: Woman	0.071	0.037	0.115***	0.068	−0.086	−0.002	0.037	−0.105*
	(0.058)	(0.063)	(0.038)	(0.051)	(0.060)	(0.062)	(0.059)	(0.056)
Lives with child(ren) under 14	0.129**	−0.124	0.285***	0.042	0.151**	0.368***	−0.096	0.060
	(0.064)	(0.081)	(0.050)	(0.058)	(0.060)	(0.069)	(0.063)	(0.061)
Age: 25 - 34	0.050	0.422***	0.033	0.214***	0.125	0.113	0.228**	−0.023
	(0.084)	(0.116)	(0.055)	(0.077)	(0.084)	(0.092)	(0.100)	(0.075)
Age: 35 - 49	0.252***	0.501***	0.212***	0.208***	0.096	0.049	0.362***	−0.076
	(0.077)	(0.109)	(0.055)	(0.077)	(0.078)	(0.079)	(0.087)	(0.076)
Age: 50 or older	0.222***	0.717***	0.524***	0.557***	0.395***	0.561***	0.353***	0.071
	(0.077)	(0.104)	(0.065)	(0.067)	(0.085)	(0.082)	(0.091)	(0.083)
Household income: Q2	0.075	−0.002	0.277***	0.261***	0.019	0.184**	0.159*	0.097
	(0.078)	(0.102)	(0.052)	(0.075)	(0.078)	(0.089)	(0.090)	(0.079)
Household income: Q3	0.253***	0.088	0.340***	0.324***	0.061	0.009	0.135	0.012
	(0.087)	(0.113)	(0.060)	(0.081)	(0.085)	(0.096)	(0.095)	(0.080)
Household income: Q4	0.183**	0.215**	0.410***	0.257***	0.044	0.294***	0.155*	−0.112
	(0.091)	(0.097)	(0.059)	(0.068)	(0.095)	(0.103)	(0.094)	(0.090)
Highest diploma: College	0.386***	0.394***	0.507***	0.745***	0.253***	0.165*	0.033	0.053
	(0.121)	(0.101)	(0.086)	(0.115)	(0.086)	(0.088)	(0.205)	(0.120)
Highest diploma: High school	0.291**	0.398***	0.443***	0.541***	0.200**	−0.049	0.187	0.016
	(0.116)	(0.095)	(0.083)	(0.114)	(0.081)	(0.092)	(0.204)	(0.111)
Economic Leaning: Very Left	0.118	0.427***	0.063	0.233	0.090	0.277**	0.072	0.460***
	(0.108)	(0.160)	(0.140)	(0.179)	(0.141)	(0.117)	(0.156)	(0.124)
Economic Leaning: Center	−0.205**	0.225**	−0.125*	0.055	−0.162	0.029	0.139	−0.035
	(0.085)	(0.087)	(0.071)	(0.102)	(0.100)	(0.093)	(0.108)	(0.085)
Economic Leaning: Right	−0.188*	0.185**	−0.033	0.187*	0.062	0.071	0.432***	0.055
	(0.101)	(0.093)	(0.078)	(0.108)	(0.108)	(0.114)	(0.119)	(0.100)
Economic Leaning: Very Right	−0.187*	0.549***	0.452***	0.336***	−0.080	−0.019	0.454***	0.166
	(0.100)	(0.167)	(0.081)	(0.114)	(0.124)	(0.118)	(0.116)	(0.119)
Treatment: Climate Impacts	0.117	0.142*	0.045	0.015	0.116	−0.084	0.059	0.104
	(0.077)	(0.086)	(0.048)	(0.068)	(0.078)	(0.082)	(0.077)	(0.074)
Treatment: Climate Policies	0.126	0.087	0.062	0.159**	0.068	0.137	0.141*	0.208***
	(0.079)	(0.089)	(0.049)	(0.066)	(0.083)	(0.083)	(0.082)	(0.078)
Treatment: Both	0.253***	0.223**	0.128***	0.096	0.169**	0.112	0.224***	0.215***
	(0.081)	(0.088)	(0.047)	(0.071)	(0.078)	(0.079)	(0.084)	(0.077)
Panel B: Energy usage indicators								
Agglomeration size: Small	−0.057	0.111	0.056	0.004	0.090	0.539**	−0.035	0.102
	(0.140)	(0.103)	(0.053)	(0.071)	(0.104)	(0.213)	(0.108)	(0.089)
Agglomeration size: Medium	0.157	−0.011	0.150**	0.015	0.162	0.181	−0.038	−0.022
	(0.138)	(0.127)	(0.064)	(0.097)	(0.116)	(0.206)	(0.116)	(0.115)
Agglomeration size: Large	0.195	0.284**	0.053	−0.019	0.144	0.383**	0.012	0.037
	(0.131)	(0.125)	(0.058)	(0.079)	(0.100)	(0.194)	(0.110)	(0.093)
Public transport available	0.175***	0.082	0.374***	0.224***	0.037	0.167***	0.124*	0.260***
	(0.064)	(0.073)	(0.046)	(0.060)	(0.080)	(0.058)	(0.067)	(0.055)
Uses car	−0.030	0.175**	0.165*	0.266***	−0.142**	−0.005	−0.045	−0.038
	(0.075)	(0.069)	(0.092)	(0.060)	(0.072)	(0.069)	(0.073)	(0.069)
High gas expenses	0.049	−0.034	−0.046		−0.146**	−0.043	−0.109	−0.038
	(0.060)	(0.077)	(0.041)		(0.061)	(0.068)	(0.073)	(0.059)
High heating expenses		0.082				−0.223***	−0.006	0.107*
		(0.075)				(0.070)	(0.062)	(0.057)
Flies more than once a year	0.074	0.061	0.219***	−0.099	0.168**	0.149**	−0.206**	0.098
	(0.072)	(0.087)	(0.044)	(0.070)	(0.071)	(0.072)	(0.086)	(0.077)
Works in polluting sector	−0.361***	0.259***	−0.118**	−0.126*	0.012	0.067	0.048	0.011
	(0.078)	(0.065)	(0.049)	(0.069)	(0.067)	(0.073)	(0.071)	(0.073)
Eats beef/meat weekly or more	0.038	−0.158**	−0.004	0.130**	0.066	0.125**	0.050	−0.073
	(0.067)	(0.077)	(0.038)	(0.064)	(0.062)	(0.063)	(0.066)	(0.057)
Owner or landlord	−0.002	0.147*	0.214***	0.268***	0.099	0.068	0.054	0.022
	(0.063)	(0.079)	(0.061)	(0.075)	(0.072)	(0.063)	(0.072)	(0.058)
Observations	2,193	1,871	2,965	3,024	2,288	2,125	1,791	2,369
R^2	0.092	0.150	0.369	0.207	0.064	0.156	0.075	0.065

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of *Support for main policies index* on socioeconomic indicators (Panel A) and on energy usage indicators (Panel B). Panel B also controls for socioeconomic indicators, but the coefficients are not displayed. Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

Table A19: Correlation between knowledge or support for the main climate policies and beliefs on the extended sample

	Knowledge or Support				
	Knowledge index	Main climate policies index	Green infrastructure program	Ban on combustion-engine cars	Carbon tax with cash transfers
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Control group mean	-0.065	-0.095	0.648	0.51	0.46
Trusts the governement	−0.0001	0.037***	0.007***	0.005**	0.019***
	(0.0005)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)
Believes inequality is an important problem	0.002***	0.040***	0.011***	0.009***	0.023***
	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Worries about the consequences of CC	−0.003***	0.043***	0.019***	0.017***	0.008**
	(0.001)	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Believes net-zero is technically feasible	−0.003***	0.024***	0.010***	0.011***	0.005*
	(0.001)	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Believes will suffer from climate change	0.002***	0.059***	0.022***	0.029***	0.011***
	(0.001)	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Understands emission across activities/regions	0.524***	0.009**	0.011***	0.008***	0.005**
	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Knows CC is real & caused by human	0.375***	0.060***	0.020***	0.020***	0.006**
	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Knows which gases cause CC	0.387***	0.010***	0.009***	0.008***	0.009***
	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Understands impacts of CC	0.350***	0.001	0.005**	−0.005*	−0.008***
	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Believes policies entail positive econ. effects	−0.002***	0.074***	0.025***	0.017***	0.017***
	(0.0005)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)
Believes policies would reduce pollution	−0.002**	0.117***	0.085***	0.053***	0.025***
	(0.001)	(0.007)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Believes policies would reduce emissions	0.003***	0.280***	0.080***	0.085***	0.117***
	(0.001)	(0.008)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Believes own household would lose	−0.0002	−0.339***	−0.083***	−0.112***	−0.110***
	(0.001)	(0.007)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Believes low-income earners will lose	−0.003***	−0.063***	0.001	−0.014***	−0.036***
	(0.001)	(0.006)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Believes high-income earners will lose	0.002***	0.013***	0.004**	0.005**	0.009***
	(0.0005)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Observations	45,904	45,904	45,904	45,904	45,904
R^2	0.995	0.650	0.385	0.359	0.377

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of the knowledge indices on socioeconomic indicators (Panel A) and on energy usage indicators (Panel B), controlling for country fixed effects. Panel B also controls for socioeconomic indicators, but the coefficients are not displayed. The dependent variable in column 1 is the *Knowledge index*, whose components are the indices in the remaining columns. Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

A-6.3 Attrition analysis

The survey companies do not disclose the number of invites they send. Among the 192,273 people who started the survey, 122,149 were excluded after the socio-demographic questions because some of their quotas were already filled in the final sample. Out of the 70,124 respondents allowed to participate, 15,812 dropped out at some point, including 7,123 after the socio-demographic questions (i.e. after the topic had been revealed). Out of 54,312 respondents allowed to participate who did not drop out, 9,858 were excluded for failing the attention test, and among those who remained, 3,774 were excluded for completing the questionnaire in less than 11.5 minutes (thus, 13,632 were excluded in total). The final sample comprises 40,680 respondents. For more details, Table A21 shows the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents who dropped out, rushed through the questionnaire, or failed the attention test. Women, younger, lower-income, and less educated respondents are more

Table A20: Effects of the treatments on support for climate action on the extended sample

	Support or Agreement				
	Green infrastructure program	Ban on combustion-engine cars	Carbon tax with cash transfers	Fairness of main climate policies index	Adopt climate-friendly behaviors
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Control group mean	0.648	0.51	0.46	-0.094	-0.049
Treatment: Climate impacts	0.016**	0.020***	0.030***	0.058***	0.068***
	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.016)	(0.016)
Treatment: Climate policy	0.026***	0.047***	0.095***	0.141***	0.035**
	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.016)	(0.016)
Treatment: Both	0.041***	0.072***	0.117***	0.189***	0.094***
	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.016)	(0.016)
Observations	45,904	45,904	45,904	45,904	45,904
R^2	0.096	0.090	0.099	0.035	0.027

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of indicator or continuous variables on socioeconomic indicators and on energy usage indicators, controlling for country fixed effects. The dependent variable are indicator variables equal to 1 if the respondent (somewhat or strongly) supports each of the main climate policies (columns 1, 2, 3), or indices (4, 5). Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

likely to drop out, but the differences in attrition rates are not large.

Table A21: Attrition analysis

	Dropped out	Dropped out after socio-eco	Failed attention test	Duration (in min)	Duration below 11.5 min
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Control group mean	0.196	0.078	0.157	35.712	0.322
Gender: Woman	0.026***	0.020***	−0.027***	8.639***	0.006**
	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(1.670)	(0.003)
Lives with child(ren)	0.007**	0.002	0.032***	−6.067***	0.026***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(1.732)	(0.003)
Age: 18 - 24	0.085*	0.260***	0.131***	−44.953***	0.260***
	(0.043)	(0.074)	(0.024)	(9.702)	(0.033)
Age: 25 - 34	0.027	0.209***	0.087***	−38.729***	0.179***
	(0.043)	(0.074)	(0.024)	(9.784)	(0.033)
Age: 35 - 49	0.029	0.205***	0.055**	−34.641***	0.124***
	(0.043)	(0.074)	(0.023)	(9.889)	(0.033)
Age: 50 or older	0.046	0.217***	−0.024	−28.552***	0.047
	(0.043)	(0.074)	(0.023)	(10.315)	(0.033)
Household income: Q2	−0.544***	0.118***	0.161***	−70.720***	−0.351***
	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.007)	(23.860)	(0.011)
Household income: Q3	−0.556***	0.105***	0.145***	−64.539***	−0.347***
	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.007)	(24.026)	(0.011)
Household income: Q4	−0.553***	0.106***	0.139***	−66.943***	−0.340***
	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.007)	(23.940)	(0.011)
Highest diploma: College	−0.060	−0.143*	−0.004	89.445***	−0.142***
	(0.043)	(0.074)	(0.023)	(20.617)	(0.033)
Highest diploma: High school	−0.054	−0.130*	0.002	91.845***	−0.160***
	(0.043)	(0.074)	(0.023)	(20.529)	(0.033)
Economic Leaning: Very Left	0.012*	0.017***	0.041***	4.229	0.013*
	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(3.211)	(0.007)
Economic Leaning: Center	0.004	0.008**	0.010***	1.307	0.007
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(1.867)	(0.005)
Economic Leaning: Right	−0.011**	−0.006	0.019***	−0.809	0.021***
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(1.992)	(0.005)
Economic Leaning: Very Right	−0.008	−0.005	0.065***	−0.944	0.045***
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(2.327)	(0.006)
Economic Leaning: PNR	0.161***	0.044***	0.038***	−3.789	0.231***
	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(3.050)	(0.008)
Treatment: Climate Impacts	0.034***	0.017***	−0.018***	4.532*	−0.034***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(2.549)	(0.004)
Treatment: Climate Policies	0.038***	0.038***	−0.022***	7.183***	−0.044***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(2.667)	(0.004)
Treatment: Both	0.057***	0.042***	−0.027***	7.404***	−0.054***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(2.403)	(0.004)
Agglomeration size: Large	0.004	0.031***	0.014	44.212***	0.022
	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(10.170)	(0.021)
Agglomeration size: Medium	0.008	0.039***	0.025***	40.794***	0.024
	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(10.119)	(0.021)
Agglomeration size: Small	0.015*	0.046***	0.047***	43.194***	0.052**
	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(10.063)	(0.021)
Public transport available	−0.028***	−0.005*	−0.001	−1.409	−0.042***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(1.446)	(0.003)
Car usage	−0.043***	0.017***	−0.033***	4.228***	−0.127***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(1.565)	(0.004)
Gas expenses	−0.072***	−0.060***	−0.001	1.328	−0.042***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(1.976)	(0.004)
Heating expenses	−0.054***	−0.047***	−0.003	−5.180**	−0.047***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(2.233)	(0.004)
Flies more than once a year	−0.016***	0.001	0.027***	0.744	0.015***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(1.590)	(0.004)
Sector of activity	−0.002	0.005	0.090***	−4.667***	0.096***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(1.353)	(0.004)
Eats beef/meat weekly or more	−0.024***	−0.001	0.007**	0.800	−0.021***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(1.516)	(0.003)
Home ownership	−0.004	−0.009***	−0.005*	−0.571	0.0004
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(1.378)	(0.004)
Observations	70,124	70,124	70,124	70,124	70,124
R^2	0.412	0.072	0.093	0.005	0.332

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of indicators on socioeconomic indicators and on energy usage indicators, controlling for country fixed effects. The dependent variable are indicator variables equal to 1 if the respondent dropped out voluntarily (1), dropped out voluntarily after the questions on social, demographic, and energy characteristics (2), failed the attention test (3), or completed the survey in less than 11.5 minutes (4). All observations are used, including respondents who dropped out. Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

Table A22: Balance analysis

	Analysis sample			Full sample		
	Treatment Climate impacts	Treatment Climate policy	Treatment Both	Treatment Climate impacts	Treatment Climate policy	Treatment Both
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Control group mean	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gender: Woman	−0.005	−0.003	0.009**	−0.006*	−0.004	0.010***
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Lives with child(ren) under 14	−0.003	0.002	0.004	−0.005	0.003	0.003
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Age: 25 - 34	0.008	0.013	−0.011	0.006	0.010*	−0.006
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Age: 35 - 49	0.014*	−0.004	−0.014*	0.010*	−0.002	−0.005
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Age: 50 or older	0.011	−0.004	−0.016**	0.009	0.002	0.001
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Household income: Q2	0.005	−0.007	0.003	0.003	−0.004	−0.001
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Household income: Q3	0.001	−0.005	0.006	0.003	−0.007	0.001
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.005)
Household income: Q4	−0.004	−0.008	0.017**	0.002	−0.007	0.008
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Highest diploma: College	0.009	0.003	−0.013	0.002	0.006	−0.006
	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Highest diploma: High school	0.018**	0.005	−0.024***	0.011	0.006	−0.014**
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Economic Leaning: Very Left	0.005	0.015	−0.024**	0.007	0.010	−0.020**
	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)
Economic Leaning: Center	0.003	0.006	−0.010	−0.001	0.003	−0.010*
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Economic Leaning: Right	0.001	0.006	−0.009	−0.006	0.004	−0.008
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Economic Leaning: Very Right	0.006	0.012	−0.013	0.004	0.006	−0.015**
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Agglomeration size: Small	−0.002	0.002	0.008	−0.002	−0.0004	0.003
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Agglomeration size: Medium	0.004	−0.005	−0.006	−0.001	−0.006	−0.003
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Agglomeration size: Large	0.003	0.001	0.001	−0.003	0.001	−0.001
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Public transport available	−0.010**	0.002	0.007	−0.007*	0.004	0.003
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Uses car	0.004	−0.001	−0.012**	0.006	−0.003	−0.004
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
High gas expenses	−0.001	−0.003	0.006	0.005	−0.002	0.007
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
High heating expenses	−0.017***	0.007	0.010**	−0.001	0.002	0.002
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Flies more than once a year	0.008	−0.0003	−0.001	0.006	−0.003	−0.001
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Works in polluting sector	−0.0001	0.003	−0.001	0.001	0.001	−0.005
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Eats beef/meat weekly or more	0.005	−0.001	0.002	0.002	−0.002	0.003
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Owner or landlord	0.005	−0.001	−0.002	−0.0001	0.002	−0.005
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Observations	40,680	40,680	40,680	53,469	53,469	53,469
R^2	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.001

Note: The table shows the results of regressions of indicators on socioeconomic indicators and on energy usage indicators, controlling for country fixed effects. The dependent variable are indicators equal to 1 if the respondent was assigned to this treatment group. Columns (1)-(3) use the analysis sample restricted to those who did not rush through the survey and passed the attention check; columns (4)-(6) use the full sample (all respondents who did not drop out). Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. See Appendix A-1 for variable definitions.

A-7 Data sources

A-7.1 References

The supplementary spreadsheet *sources.xlsx* contains all sources used in the pedagogical videos or the questions, and sources for national statistics for quotas and sample representativeness. It also contains explanations for how we compute the cash transfers that can be funded by a carbon tax, which appear in the questions and videos. We provide a brief summary below.

A-7.1.1 Computations of the country-specific cash transfers

We directly tell respondents about the increase in fuel prices in local currency that would result from the carbon tax. To do so, we implicitly consider a carbon tax of \$45 per ton of CO_2 and compute the implied increase in fuel prices based on the carbon content of the fuel and the national fuel prices in each country. The revenues from this carbon tax are redistributed in the form of equal cash transfer to each adult. To compute the level of cash transfers, we assumed that the tax covers territorial CO_2 emissions from fossil fuels (JRC 2018) that consumers bear 80% of the incidence of the carbon tax, and that the elasticity of fuel consumption with respect to the tax is -0.2 (in line with the literature, e.g. Green (2021); Labandeira, Labeaga and López-Otero (2017)).

A-7.2 Quotas

A-7.2.1 Detailed Regional Brackets

- **Australia**:
  - Region 1: *Broad New South Wales* (Australian Capital Territory; New South Wales)
  - Region 2: *Queensland*
  - Region 3: *South Australia*
  - Region 4: *Victoria-Tasmania* (Tasmania; Victoria; Other territories)
  - Region 5: *West Australia* (Northern Territory; Western Australia)
- **Canada**:
  - Region 1: *Central* (Manitoba; Saskatchewan)
  - Region 2: *East* (New Brunswick; Newfoundland and Labrador; Nova Scotia; Prince Edward Island)
  - Region 3: *North West* (Alberta; British Columbia; Northwest Territories; Nunavut; Yukon)
  - Region 4: *Ontario*

  - Region 5: *Quebec*

- **Denmark**:
  - Region 1: *Hovedstaden*
  - Region 2: *Midtjylland*
  - Region 3: *Nordjylland*
  - Region 4: *Sjælland*
  - Region 5: *Syddanmark*

- **France**:
  - Region 1: *Île de France*
  - Region 2: *Nord-Est* (Bourgogne-Franche-Comté; Grand Est ; Hauts-de-France)
  - Region 3: *Nord-Ouest* (Bretagne; Centre-Val de Loire; Normandie; Pays de la Loire ; Poitou-Charentes)
  - Region 4: *Sud-Est* (Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes; PACA)
  - Region 5: *Sud-Ouest* (Aquitaine; Languedoc-Roussillon; Limousin; Midi-Pyrénées)

- **Germany**:
  - Region 1: *Central* (Hesse; Thuringia)
  - Region 2: *Eastern* (Berlin; Brandenburg; Saxony; Saxony-Anhalt)
  - Region 3: *Northern* (Bremen; Hamburg; Lower Saxony; Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania; Schleswig-Holstein)
  - Region 4: *Southern* (Baden-Württemberg; Bavaria)
  - Region 5: *Western* (North Rhine-Westphalia; Rhineland-Palatinate; Saarland)

- **Italy**:
  - Region 1: *Centre*
  - Region 2: *Islands*
  - Region 3: *North-East*
  - Region 4: *North-West*
  - Region 5: *South*

- **Japan**:
  - Region 1: *Chubu* (Aichi; Fukui; Gifu; Ishikawa; Nagano; Niigata; Shizuoka; Toyama; Yamanashi)

  - Region 2: *Kansai* (Hyōgo; Kyōto; Mie; Nara; Ōsaka; Shiga; Wakayama)
  - Region 3: *Kanto* (Chiba; Gunma; Ibaraki; Kanagawa; Saitama; Tochigi; Tōkyō)
  - Region 4: *North* (Akita; Aomori; Fukushima; Hokkaido; Iwate; Miyagi; Yamagata)
  - Region 5: *South* (Ehime; Fukuoka; Hiroshima; Kagawa; Kagoshima; Kōchi; Kumamoto; Miyazaki; Nagasaki; Ōita; Okayama; Okinawa; Saga; Shimane; Tokushima; Tottori; Yamaguchi)

- **Poland**:
  - Region 1: *Central* (Lubusz; Greater Poland)
  - Region 2: *Central-East* (Lesser Poland; Subcarpathian)
  - Region 3: *North* (Podlaskie; Pomeranian; Kuyavian-Pomeranian; Warman-Masurian; West Pomeranian)
  - Region 4: *South-East* (Holy Cross; Lodz; Lubin; Masovian)
  - Region 5: *South-West* (Lower Silesian; Opole; Silesia)

- **South Korea**:
  - Region 1: *East* (Busan; Daegu; North Gyeongsang; South Gyeongsang; Ulsan)
  - Region 2: *North* (Gangwon; Gyeonggi; Incheon)
  - Region 3: *Seoul*
  - Region 4: *West* (Daejeon; Gwanggju; Jeju; North Chungcheong; North Jeolla; Sejong; South Chungcheong; South Jeolla)

- **Spain**:
  - Region 1: *Center* (Castilla-La Mancha; Comunidad de Madrid)
  - Region 2: *East* (Cataluña; Comunidad Valenciana; Islas Baleares)
  - Region 3: *North* (Aragón; Cantabria; La Rioja; Navarra; País Vasco)
  - Region 4: *North-West* (Castilla y León; Galicia; Principado de Asturias)
  - Region 5: *South* (Andalucía; Canarias; Ceuta (Ciudad Autónoma); Extremadura; Melilla (Ciudad Autónoma); Región de Murcia)

- **U.K.**:
  - Region 1: *Central U.K.* (East Midlands; Wales; West Midlands)
  - Region 2: *London*
  - Region 3: *Northern England* (North East; North West; Yorkshire and The Humber)

  - Region 4: *Northern U.K.* (Northern Ireland; Scotland)
  - Region 5: *Southern England* (East of England; South East; South West)

- **U.S.**:
  - Region 1: *Midwest* (Ohio; Illinois; Indiana; Iowa; Kansas; Michigan; Minnesota; Missouri; Nebraska; North Dakota; South Dakota; Wisconsin)
  - Region 2: *Northeast* (Connecticut; Maine; Massachusetts; New Hampshire; New Jersey; New York; Pennsylvania; Rhode Islands; Vermont)
  - Region 3: *South* (Alabama; Arkansas; Delaware; District of Columbia; Florida; Georgia; Kentucky; Louisiana; Maryland; Mississippi; North Carolina; South Carolina; Oklahoma; Tennessee; Texas; Virginia; West Virginia)
  - Region 4: *West* (Alaska; Arizona; California; Colorado; Hawaii; Idaho; Montana; Nevada; New Mexico; Oregon; Utah; Washington; Wyoming)

- **Brazil**:
  - Region 1: *Central-West*
  - Region 2: *North*
  - Region 3: *North-East*
  - Region 4: *South*
  - Region 5: *South-East*

- **China**:
  - Region 1: *East*
  - Region 2: *North*
  - Region 3: *Northeast*
  - Region 4: *South Central*
  - Region 5: *West* (Northwest China; Southwest China)

- **India**:
  - Region 1: *Central Zonal Council*
  - Region 2: *Eastern Zonal Council* (Andaman and Nicobar Islands; North Eastern)
  - Region 3: *Northern Zonal Council*
  - Region 4: *Southern Zonal Council* (Lakshadweep)
  - Region 5: *Western Zonal Council*

- **Indonesia**:

  - Region 1: *Eastern Islands* (Bali; East Nusa Tenggara; Maluku; North Maluku; Papua; West Nusa Tenggara; West Papua)
  - Region 2: *Eastern Java* (Central Java; East Java; Yogyakarta)
  - Region 3: *Northern Islands* (Central Kalimantan; Central Sulawesi; East Kalimantan; Gorontalo; North Kalimantan; North Sulawesi; Southeast Sulawesi; South Kalimantan; South Sulawesi; West Kalimantan; West Sulawesi)
  - Region 4: *Sumatra* (Aceh; Bangka Belitung Islands; Bengkulu; Jambi; Lampung; North Sumatra; Riau; Riau Islands; South Sumatra; West Sumatra)
  - Region 5: *Western Java* (Banten; Jakarta; West Java)

- **Mexico**:
  - Region 1: *Central-Eastern* (Federal District; Hidalgo; Mexico; Morelos; Puebla; Queretaro; Tlaxcala)
  - Region 2: *Central-Western* (Aguascalientes; Colima; Jalisco; Guanajuato; Michoacan; Nayarit; San Luis Potosi; Zacatecas)
  - Region 3: *North-East* (Coahuila; Nuevo Leon; Tamaulipas)
  - Region 4: *North-West* (Baja California; Baja California Sur; Chihuahua; Durango; Sinaloa; Sonora)
  - Region 5: *South* (Campeche; Chiapas; Guerrero; Oaxaca; Quintana Roo; Tabasco; Varacruz; Yucatan)

- **South Africa**:
  - Region 1: *Center* (Free State; North West)
  - Region 2: *Gauteng*
  - Region 3: *North-East* (Limpopo; Mpumalanga)
  - Region 4: *South-East* (Eastern Cape; KwaZulu-Natal)
  - Region 5: *West* (Northern Cape; Western Cape)

- **Turkey**:
  - Region 1: *Central* (Black Sea; Central Anatolia)
  - Region 2: *East* (Eastern Anatolia; Southeastern Anatolia)
  - Region 3: *Marmara*
  - Region 4: *West* (Aegean; Mediterranean)

- **Ukraine**:
  - Region 1: *Center* (Cherkasy; Chernihiv; Kirovohrad; Kyiv; Poltava; Sumy; Vinnytsya; Zhytomyr)

- Region 2: *East* (Donetsk; Kharkiv; Luhansk)
- Region 3: *South* (Dnipropetrovsk; Kherson; Mykolayiv; Odesa; Zaporizhzhya)
- Region 4: *West* (Chernivtsi; Ivano-Frankivsk; Khmelnytski; Lviv; Rivne; Ternopil; Volyn; Zakarpattya)

A-7.2.2 Detailled urban-rural categories

- **Australia**
  - Rural: Inner Regional Australia; Outer Regional Australia; Remote Australia; Very Remote Australia
  - Urban: Major Cities of Australia
- **Canada**
  - Rural: Forward Sortation Area second character is 0
  - Urban: Forward Sortation Area second character is different from 0
- **Denmark**
  - Rural: Live in town with less than 20,000 inhabitants
  - Urban: Live in town with more than 20,000 inhabitants
- **France**
  - Rural
    - Rural category 1: Couronnes de Grand-Pôle
    - Rual category 2: Autre
  - Urban: Grand-Pôle
- **Germany**
  - Rural: Rural areas
  - Urban:
    - Urban category 1: Cities
    - Urban category 2: Towns and Suburbs
- **Italy**
  - Rural: Rural areas
  - Urban:
    - Urban category 1: Cities

    - Urban category 2: Towns and Suburbs

- **Japan**
  - Rural: Living in a town of less than 100,000 inhabitants.
  - Urban: Living in a town of more than 100,000 inhabitants.
- **Poland**
  - Rural: Living in a town of less than 20,000 inhabitants.
  - Urban: Living in a town of more than 20,000 inhabitants.
- **South Korea**
  - Rural: Live in a District (i.e., "Gum")
  - Urban:
    - Urban category 1: Live in a Town (i.e., "Si")
    - Urban category 2: Live in a City (i.e., "Gu")
- **Spain**
  - Rural: Living in a town of less than 20,000 inhabitants.
  - Urban: Living in a town of more than 20,000 inhabitants.
- **U.K.**
  - Rural: Rural village; Rural hamlet and isolated dwellings; Rural town and fringe; Rural town and fringe in a sparse setting; Rural hamlet and isolated dwellings in a sparse setting; Rural village in a sparse setting; Accessible rural area; Remote rural area; Very remote rural area; Very remote small town; Accessible small town; Remote small town
  - Urban:
    - Urban category 1: Urban city and town; Urban city and town in a sparse setting
    - Urban category 2: Urban major conurbation; Urban minor conurbation; Large urban area; Other urban area
- **U.S.**
  - Rural: RUCA code different from 1 (core metropolitan)
  - Urban: RUCA code 1 (core metropolitan)
- **Brazil**

  - Rural: Live in a municipality with less than 50,000 inhabitants
  - Urban: Live in a municipality with more than 50,000 inhabitants

- **China**
  - Rural: Live in an agglomeration of less than 10,000 inhabitants
  - Urban:
    * Urban category 1: Live in an agglomeration of more than 10,000 inhabitants and less than 500,000 inhabitants
    * Urban category 2: Live in an agglomeration of more than 500,000 inhabitants

- **India**
  - Rural: Live in an agglomeration of more than 20,000 inhabitants
  - Urban: Live in an agglomeration of more than 20,000 inhabitants

- **Indonesia**
  - Rural: In a Kabupaten outside of the Capital town
  - Urban: Kota; Capital town of a Kabupaten

- **Mexico**
  - Rural
    * Rural category 1: Rural
    * Rual category 2: Semiurbano
  - Urban: Urbano

- **South Africa**
  - Rural: Live in a District municipality other than the District capital.
  - Urban: Live in a metropolitan municipality or in a capital of a District municipality

- **Turkey**
  - Rural: Living in a district with a share of rural population greater than the national average for districts.
  - Urban: Living in a district with a share of rural population smaller than the national average for districts.

- **Ukraine**
  - Rural: Living in a Village or a settlement
  - Urban: Living in a City or an Urban settlement

A-7.2.3 Detailed education brackets

- **Australia**:
  - Offical categories used (OECD): Tertiary education
  - Corresponding questionnaire categories: College degree; Master's degree or above
- **Canada**:
  - Offical categories used (OECD): Tertiary education
  - Corresponding questionnaire categories: College degree; Master's degree or above
- **Denmark**:
  - Offical categories used (OECD): Bachelor's or equivalent education; Master's or equivalent education; Doctoral or equivalent education
  - Corresponding questionnaire categories: Professional bachelor's education; Bachelor's degree ; Master's degree or higher
- **France**:
  - Offical categories used (OECD): Tertiary education
  - Corresponding questionnaire categories: Bac + 2 or Bac + 3 (license, BTS, DUT, DEUG, etc.) ; Bac +5 or more (master's degree, engineering or business school, doctorate, medicine, master's degree, DEA, DESS ...)
- **Germany**:
  - Offical categories used (OECD): Bachelor's or equivalent education; Master's or equivalent education; Doctoral or equivalent education
  - Corresponding questionnaire categories: University degree (e.g. Bachelor) ; Master's degree or higher
- **Italy**:
  - Offical categories used (OECD): Tertiary education
  - Corresponding questionnaire categories: Professional degree ; Bachelor's degree ; Master's degree or higher
- **Japan**:
  - Offical categories used (OECD): Tertiary education
  - Corresponding questionnaire categories: Vocational school; University; Graduate school and above
- **Poland**:

  - Offical categories used (OECD): Tertiary education
  - Corresponding questionnaire categories: Bachelor's degree ; Master's degree or higher

- **South Korea**:
  - Offical categories used (OECD): Tertiary education
  - Corresponding questionnaire categories: Bachelor's degree ; Master's degree or higher

- **Spain**:
  - Offical categories used (OECD): Tertiary education
  - Corresponding questionnaire categories: University degree or higher vocational training ; Master's degree/doctoral degree

- **U.K.**:
  - Offical categories used (OECD): Tertiary education
  - Corresponding questionnaire categories: Vocational degree ; College degree ; Master's degree or above

- **U.S.**:
  - Offical categories used (U.S. Census): Some college, no degree; Associate's degree; Bachelor's degree; Graduate or professional degree
  - Corresponding questionnaire categories: College degree ; Master's degree or above

- **Brazil**:
  - Offical categories used (OECD): Tertiary education
  - Corresponding questionnaire categories: University education ; Graduate or higher

- **China**:
  - Offical categories used (OECD): Tertiary education
  - Corresponding questionnaire categories: Undergraduate ; Master and above

- **India**:
  - Offical categories used (OECD): Tertiary education
  - Corresponding questionnaire categories: College degree ; Master's degree or above

- **Indonesia**:

  - Offical categories used (OECD): Tertiary education
  - Corresponding questionnaire categories: Bachelor ; Master or higher

- **Mexico**:
  - Offical categories used (OECD): Bachelor's or equivalent education; Master's or equivalent education; Doctoral or equivalent education
  - Corresponding questionnaire categories: Technical or intermediate education ; University degree or higher vocational training ; Master's degree/doctorate

- **South Africa**:
  - Offical categories used (OECD): Tertiary education
  - Corresponding questionnaire categories: College degree ; Master's degree or above

- **Turkey**:
  - Offical categories used (OECD): Bachelor's or equivalent education; Master's or equivalent education; Doctoral or equivalent education
  - Corresponding questionnaire categories: Graduated from a Universty ; Master's degree or higher

- **Ukraine**:
  - Offical categories used (State Statistics Service of Ukraine): Primary level (short cycle) of higher education; The first (bachelor's) level of higher education; The second (master's) level of higher education; The third (educational-scientific / educational-creative) level of higher education; Scientific level of higher education
  - Corresponding questionnaire categories: Specialist or bachelor's degree ; Master's or higher degree

A-7.2.4 Detailed voting categories

- **Australia**:
  - Election considered: *2019 Australian federal election (House of Representatives)*
  - Left: Greens; Labor
  - Center: N/A
  - Right: Liberal/National coalition
  - Other: Other

- **Canada**:
  - Election considered: *2021 Federal election*

  - Left: Bloc Québécois; Green; Liberal; New Democratic
  - Center: N/A
  - Right: Conservative; People's Party
  - Other: Other

- **Denmark**:
  - Election considered: *Folketingsvalg (i 2019)*
  - Left: Alternativet; Enhedslisten; Socialdemokratiet; Socialistisk Folkeparti
  - Center: Radikale Venstre
  - Right: Danske Folkeparti; Det Konservative Folkeparti; Liberal Alliance; Nye Borgerlige; Venstre
  - Other: Other

- **France**:
  - Election considered: *2017 Presidential Election*
  - Left: Arthaud; Hamon; Melenchon; Poutou
  - Center: Macron
  - Right: Asselineau; Dupont-Aignan; Fillon; Le Pen
  - Other: Cheminade; Lassalle; Other

- **Germany**:
  - Election considered: *Bundestagswahl 2017*
  - Left: Bundnis 90/Die Grünen; Die Linke; SPD
  - Center: FDP
  - Right: AfD; CDU/CSU
  - Other: Other

- **Italy**:
  - Election considered: *2018 Italian General Election*
  - Left: Liberi e Uguali; Partito Democratico
  - Center: Movimento 5 Stelle
  - Right: Forza Italia; Fratelli d'Italia; Lega
  - Other: Other

- **Japan**:

- Election considered: *2021 General elections*
- Left: Constitutional Democratic Party of Japan; Japanese Communist Party; Social Democratic Party
- Center: Democratic Party for the People; Komeito; Japan Innovation Party
- Right: Liberal Democratic Party
- Other: Other

- **Poland**:
  - Election considered: *2020 Polish presidential election*
  - Left: Robert Biedron; Waldemar Witkowski
  - Center: Szymon Hołownia; Władysław Kosiniak-Kamysz
  - Right: Krzysztof Bosak; Andrzej Duda; Marek Jakubiak; Mirosław Piotrowski; Paweł Tanajno; Rafał Trzaskowski; Stanisław Żółtek
  - Other: Other

- **South Korea**:
  - Election considered: *2017 South Korean presidential election*
  - Left: Moon Jae-in; Sim Sang-jung
  - Center: Ahn Cheol-soo
  - Right: Hong Joon-pyo; Yoo Seong-min
  - Other: Other

- **Spain**:
  - Election considered: *November 2019 Spanish General Election*
  - Left: Esquerra Republicana; PSOE; Unidas Podemos
  - Center: Ciudadanos
  - Right: PP; VOX
  - Other: Other

- **U.K.**:
  - Election considered: *2019 General Election*
  - Left: Green; Labour; SNP
  - Center: Liberal Democrats
  - Right: Brexit Party; Conservative
  - Other: Other

- **U.S.**:
  - Election considered: *2020 Presidential Election*
  - Left: Biden
  - Center: N/A
  - Right: Trump
  - Other: Hawkins; Jorgensen; Other
- **Brazil**:
  - Election considered: *2018 Brazilian General Election*
  - Left: Fernando Haddad; Marina Silva
  - Center: Geraldo Alckmin; Alvaro Dias; Ciro Gomes; Henrique Meirelles
  - Right: Joao Amoedo; Jair Bolsonaro; Cabo Daciolo
  - Other: Other
- **India**:
  - Election considered: *2019 Indian General Election*
  - Left: AITC; BSP; CPO; DMK; INC; Other UPA; SP; YSR Congress
  - Center: N/A
  - Right: BJP; Other NDA; SS; TDP
  - Other: Other
- **Indonesia**:
  - Election considered: *2019 Indonesian General Election*
  - Left: PDI-P
  - Center: PAN; PKB
  - Right: Demokrat; Gerindra; Golkar; Nasdem; PKS; PPP
  - Other: Other
- **Mexico**:
  - Election considered: *Elecciones Generales de Junio 2021*
  - Left: MORENA; Movimiento Ciudadano; PRD; PT; VERDE
  - Center: PRI
  - Right: PAN
  - Other: Other

- **South Africa**:
  - Election considered: *2019 South African General Election*
  - Left: ANC; EEF
  - Center: DA
  - Right: FF Plus; IFP
  - Other: Other
- **Turkey**:
  - Election considered: *2018 Turkish General Election*
  - Left: Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi; Halkların Demokratik Partisi; Vatan Partisi
  - Center: İYİ Parti
  - Right: Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi; Hür Dava Partisi; Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi; Saadet Partisi
  - Other: Other
- **Ukraine**:
  - Election considered: *2019 Presidential Elections*
  - Left: Petro Poroshenko
  - Center: Iouri Boïko; Anatoliy Hrytsenko; Ioulia Tymochenko; Oleksandr Vilkul; Volodymyr Zelensky
  - Right: Ruslan Koshulynskyi; Oleh Lyashko; Ihor Smeshko
  - Other: Other

A-7.3 Correct answers to knowledge questions

Question	Correct Answer	Source
In your opinion, is climate change real?	Yes	IPCC (2021)
What part of climate change do you think is due to human activity?	Most (*if not all*)	IPCC (2021), Figure SPM.1
Which of the following elements contribute to climate change? (Multiple answers are possible)	CO_2; Methane	IPCC (2021), Figure SPM.5
Do you think that cutting global greenhouse gas emissions by half would be sufficient to eventually stop temperatures from rising?	No (*net zero CO_2 emissions is required*)	IPCC (2021), D.1
If a family of 4 travels 700 km from A to B, with which mode of transportation do they emit the most greenhouse gases? Please rank the items from 1 (most) to 3 (least)	Plane (1) Car (running on diesel or gasoline) (2) Train / Coach (3)	Ecopassenger, U.S.: National Geographic Other: China (1), China (2), India, Indonesia
Which dish emits the most greenhouse gases? We consider that each dish weighs half a pound. Please rank the items from 1 (most) to 3 (least)	Beef [India: Lamb] (1) Chicken wings (2) Serving of Pasta [Asia: rice] (3)	Poore and Nemecek (2018)
Which source of electric energy emits the most greenhouse gases to provide power for a house? Please rank the items from 1 (most) to 3 (least)	Coal-fired power station (1) Gas-fired power plant (2) Nuclear power plant (3)	Pehl et al. (2017)
Which region contributes most to global greenhouse gas emissions? Please rank the regions from 1 (most) to 4 (least)	China (1); U.S. (2) E.U. (3); India (4)	JRC (2018)
In which region does the consumption of an average person contribute most to greenhouse gas emissions? Please rank the regions from 1 (most) to 5 (least).	U.S. (1); E.U. (2) China (3); India (4)	Global_Carbon_Project (2019)
If nothing is done to limit climate change, how likely do you think it is that climate change will lead to the following events?	Severe droughts and heatwaves (Likely) Rising sea levels (Likely) More frequent volcanic eruptions (Unlikely)	IPCC (2014)

Appendix References

Global_Carbon_Project (2019). Supplemental data of Global Carbon Project 2019. Version Number: 1.0 Type: dataset.

IPCC, AR5, ed (2014). *Climate change 2014: impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability: Working Group II contribution to the fifth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.* New York, NY:Cambridge University Press.

IPCC, AR6 (2021). Summary for Policymakers. In *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*.

JRC, European Commission (2018). Fossil CO2 Emissions of all World Countries: 2018 report.

Kling, Jeffrey R, Jeffrey B Liebman, and Lawrence F Katz (2007). Experimental Analysis of Neighborhood Effects. *Econometrica*, 75(1): 83–119.

Pehl, Michaja, Anders Arvesen, Florian Humpenöder, Alexander Popp, Edgar G. Hertwich, and Gunnar Luderer (2017). Understanding future emissions from low-carbon power systems by integration of life-cycle assessment and integrated energy modelling. *Nature Energy*, 2(12): 939–945.

Poore, J., and T. Nemecek (2018). Reducing food's environmental impacts through producers and consumers. *Science*, 360(6392): 987–992.